DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 633 JC 870 407

AUTHOR Ruden, John E.
TITLE The Los Rios Transfer Centers: A First Year Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Los Rios Community Coll. District, Sacramento, Calif.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 99p.; Prepared by the Office of Planning and Research.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Educationally Disadvantaged; Higher Education; Multicampus Districts; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Student Personnel Services; *Transfer Programs; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Transfer Centers

ABSTRACT

The Los Rios Transfer Centers were established to provide adequate transfer resources, information, and intersegmental cooperation and articulation to increase the rate of transfer to four-year institutions among minority, disabled, low income, and other underrepresented students. In order to develop a profile of students who were using the centers and to identify areas for the improvement or expansion of services, questionnaires were sent to more than 1,400 students who used the centers during their first year of operation. Study findings, based on an adjusted response rate of 48.5% included the following: (1) counselor referrals were by far the most effective means of making the students aware of the centers; (2) women, particularly those in their 30's, made up the majority of center contacts; (3) males made up the majority of Asian contacts, however, among those who had transferred, Asian women clearly outnumbered Asian men; (4) ethnic minorities had better representation among center users than in the district's student population as a whole, although whites made up the majority of center contacts; (5) respondents tended to be enrolled for more units than the typical Los Rios student, and had higher rates of course completion; (6) 43% of the respondents were first-generation college students; (7) student comments strongly supported having university representatives who were specifically hired for work in the centers; and (8) those respondents who had already transferred rated their Los Rios preparation highly. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285633

The Los Rios Transfer Centers: A First Year Evaluation

August 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John E. Ruden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Office of Planning and Research
Los Rios Community College District
1919 Spanos Court, Sacramento, CA 95825

JC 870 407

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Sacramento City College 1916 — American River College 1955 — Cosumnes River College 1970

DAVID MERTES
Chancellor/Superintendent

THE LOS RIOS TRANSFER CENTERS: A FIRST YEAR EVALUATION

Executive Summary

The Los Rios District Transfer Centers at American River, Cosumnes River, and Sacramento City colleges, which were established during the Fall 1985 semester as a result of a statewide pilot program funded in the Governor's 1985 Budget, were unique because they were parts of the only multicampus district request approved for the program. This current study resulted both from the legislative requirement that we be able to document which students used the services, and the desire in Los Rios to evaluate our efforts and target areas where services could be improved or expanded. The study was conducted by the Los Rios staff in Planning and Research with full cooperation and assistance from the University of California at Davis and from the California State University at Sacramento. Questionnaires were sent to over 1,400 students who used the Centers during their first year of operation, and an adjusted response rate of 48.5% was realized.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- Respondents gave a high rating to the Transfer Center services, and the additional comments they made supported this finding.
- Counselor referrals were by far the most effective means of making the student respondents aware of the Centers.
- Women, particularly those in their 30's, made up the majority of Transfer Center contacts, although among the "traditional" 18-24 year old group, the ratio between men and women was generally even.
- Males made up the majority of Asian contacts in the Center; however, among those respondents who had transferred, Asian women clearly outnumbered Asian men.
- Ethnic minorities were better represented as Center users than their proportions in the district's student population, although whites made up the majority of Transfer Center contacts.
- Respondents tended to be enrolled for more units than the typical Los Rios student, and they demonstrated they could complete them.
- The mean Grade Point Average of the respondents was above 3.0.
- 43% of the respondents were first generation college students.
- Student comments strongly support having university representatives who are specifically hired for work in the Centers, such as with the arrangement between UC Davis and Los Rios.

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 • (916) 920-7821

- Those respondents who had already transferred rated their Los Rios preparation high.

- Two out of three respondents who had transferred had accumulated more than 60 units at Los Rios before transfer, and more than a quarter had accumulated more than 75 units, suggesting that these students may not have been eligible for UC or CSU right out of high school, or that they began in a vocational program.

- More than 40% of the respondents who had already transferred had not indicated a transfer goal when they first enrolled in Los Rios.

- Nearly half the respondents supported expanding the Transfer Center services so that more personal contact from four-year school representatives would be possible.

- Full Transfer Center services for evening students could increase the effectiveness of the program.

CONCLUSIONS

Those people responsible for providing Transfer Center services should be pleased with their efforts. The respondents' frequent requests for more services clearly resulted from their satisfaction with the assistance that was provided. Additional efforts to reach more students and to extend staffing hours of the Centers are clearly justified, given this report. The challenge for those responsible for the Transfer Center project will be to expand the most effective services and to make all students aware of the available assistance.

THE LOS RIOS TRANSFER CENTERS: A FIRST YEAR EVALUATION

John E. Ruden
Faculty Research Associate

August, 1987

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
1919 Spanos Court
Sacramento, California 95825-3981

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The efforts of many people were essential to allow me to complete this project, and I wish to thank them for their assistance. Barbara Loughridge Howard, who directs the Transfer Center Project for Los Rios, initiated the plan for a survey and organized its budget. Linda Case arranged for the UC Davis Reprographics Department to typeset and print the questionnaire. Loretta Lutz and Toyoko Seno helped prepare two sets of questionnaires for mailing, and Duane Anderson coordinated the mailing at CSU Sacramento. Linda Nishimoto prepared the mailing lists and produced the computer screens for data entry. Greg Washington was involved from the beginning to the end of this project--printing envelopes and letters, receiving the returns, and printing the report. The written comments were analyzed at UC Davis by Gary Tudor and Bernard Yaklin.

Finally, the staff of the Office of Planning and Research deserve an extra measure of gratitude for the encouragement and labor they gave. Corina Light devoted many hours to data entry. Ann Lynch, always ready to offer assistance with word processing, organized the final preparation of the manuscript. Beth Lee, whose experience with similar surveys was essential, was constantly available for consultation and practical advice. Randall Jones is remarkable because he has not only the computer expertise that made the data analysis possible, but also the knowledge of research and writing requirements that allowed the data to be presented and interpreted easily. His contributions continually made themselves evident as I moved from one stage to the next, and many more, I fear, go unrecognized because, ironically, they were so essential. Janis Coffey, whose experience at all levels of college research can whip almost any project such as this into shape, gave the most positive supervision and encouragement possible and helped make it both a serious and pleasurable task on which to work. All of these people I thank for their help.

John E. Ruden

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

THE LOS RIOS TRANSFER CENTERS: A FIRST YEAR EVALUATION

BACKGROUND 1

INTRODUCTION 2

MAJOR FINDINGS 2

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN 3

DISTRIBUTION 3

RESPONSE RATE 3

DATA ANALYSIS 4

SURVEY RESULTS 5

SECTION A 5
Student Awareness of Transfer Center 5
Ratings of Transfer Center Services 6
Ratings of Transfer Center Workshops 7
Transfer Admission Agreement 8
Anticipated Transfer Major 9
Applying to a Four-year School 10
Applying for Financial Aid 11
Current Educational Status 12

SECTION B 13
Transfer College and Major 13
Problems with Transfer 15
Units Lost in Transfer 16
Transfer Status 17
Rating the Los Rios Preparation 18

SECTION C 19
Family College Background 19
Rating the Transfer Center's Helpfulness for Others 20
Suggestions for Improvement 21

STUDENT COMMENTS 22
Suggestions for Additional Workshops 22
Other Suggestions 23
Additional Comments 24

DEMOGRAPHICS 26
Ethnicity Compared to District Figures 26
Age, Sex, and Ethnicity 28
Age, Sex, and Ethnicity: Another View 30
Citizenship 32
Educational Goal 33
Unit Load 34
Cumulative Units Completed 34
Grade Point Average 35

CONCLUSIONS 36

REFERENCES 37

COLLEGE TABLES 38
AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE 39
COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE 40
SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE 41

APPENDIX 42

THE LOS RIOS TRANSFER CENTERS:

A FIRST YEAR EVALUATION

BACKGROUND

The Governor's 1985 Budget included $3.373 million to fund a three-year pilot program of Transfer Centers on 20 campuses of the California Community Colleges. These centers, which were to be operated with the cooperation of the California State University and the University of California systems, were established with the goals of providing adequate transfer resources, information, and intersegmental cooperation and articulation to increase the rate of transfer among minority, disabled, low income, and other underrepresented students. The legislation particularly called for students to receive appropriate counseling and advising for academic planning, opportunities for concurrent enrollment, services to assist them in submitting necessary application forms, access to a library of transfer materials, and introductory tours of university campuses. In addition, the community colleges were required, with the cooperation of the universities, to establish an inter-institutional record system for each student being served by the Transfer Center. The Centers were to increase the amount of time and the quality of attention given to transfer-oriented students, and the operations were to be evaluated to determine whether the increased services justified continued funding and expansion or whether other functions were discovered which might justify funding. Finally, with the cooperation of the universities, the community colleges were called on to maintain contact with students to seek their cooperation in the evaluation of their services. (For a more complete description of the legislation, see A Plan for Implementing the Transfer Center Pilot Program, prepared by the California Community Colleges, the University of California, and the California State University, April, 1985.)

As a consequence of this available funding, the Los Rios Community College District submitted in July, 1985, a proposal to the State Chancellor's Office for establishing three Transfer Centers to supplement the counseling efforts at the district's three colleges: American River, Cosumnes River, and Sacramento City. The proposal, which was approved as submitted, was the only multicampus district request, and called for the program to be supervised by the Assistant Dean of Counseling Services reassigned from American River College to the district office as Program Director. In addition, the proposal provided for a 1.0 FTE secretary assigned to the Program Director, and on each campus a 0.5 FTE counselor assisted by a 0.5 FTE clerk. As the Centers developed in the fall semester of 1985, the counseling equivalent was increased from 1.5 FTE districtwide to 1.9 FTE and augmented by increasing the time of the Transfer Representative from the University of California at Davis whose salary is funded equally by Los Rios and UC Davis from 0.5 FTE to 1.0 FTE. The other two universities supporting this effort, California State University at Sacramento and the University of the Pacific, each supplied representatives to meet with students on the Los Rios campuses on a regular basis. These services were made available primarily during the day. Although the Centers were open in the evening, Transfer Center staff were not normally available to assist students. Regular counselors were available, and some attempts at providing additional evening service were made as the school year continued; however, records of students who used the Centers only in the evening are not available. Finally, the Los Rios Transfer Centers were also designated as test sites for Project ASSIST, a computerized articulation program, the goal of which is to allow students to explore numerous transfer options. With the exception of Project ASSIST, which was in developmental stages, the above outline indicates the general level of support provided to students by the Transfer Center Project at Los Rios.

INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the results of a student questionnaire that was designed by the district's Office of Planning and Research to allow the staff of the Los Rios Transfer Centers to assess specifically the quality of services students received during the first year and, based on student responses and comments, to target areas that need improvement or implement additional services that might make the Centers more valuable to students. In addition, by matching identification numbers of students who used the Centers with the district student transcript file, a profile of the clients in the Centers could be developed. Although the legislation creating the Centers mandated statewide surveys, some of which are currently in progress, the Los Rios staff felt it was important to examine our individual efforts and that this survey would be the first of a series of reports that would evaluate the district's transfer function and its relationship with the Centers.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Although the body of this report will review in detail the results of the survey, it is perhaps useful at this point to list the major findings of the survey.

- Respondents gave a high rating to the Transfer Center services, and the additional comments they made supported this finding.
- Counselor referrals were by far the most effective means of making the student respondents aware of the Centers.
- Women, particularly those in their 30's, made up the majority of Transfer Center contacts, although among the "traditional" 18-24 year old group, the ratio between men and women was generally even.
- Males made up the majority of Asian contacts in the Center; however, among those respondents who had transferred, Asian women clearly outnumbered Asian men.
- Ethnic minorities were better represented as Center users than their proportions in the district's student population, although whites made up the majority of Transfer Center contacts.
- Respondents tended to be enrolled for more units than the typical Los Rios student, and they demonstrated they could complete them.
- The mean Grade Point Average of the respondents was above 3.0.
- 43% of the respondents were first generation college students.
- Student comments strongly support having university representatives who are specifically hired for work in the Centers, such as with the arrangement between UC Davis and Los Rios.
- Those respondents who had already transferred rated their Los Rios preparation high.

- Two out of three respondents who had transferred had accumulated more than 60 units at Los Rios before transfer, and more than a quarter had accumulated more than 75 units, suggesting that these students may not have been eligible for UC or CSU right out of high school, or that they began in a vocational program.

- More than 40% of the respondents who had already transferred had not indicated a transfer goal when they first enrolled in Los Rios.

- Nearly half the respondents supported expanding the Transfer Center services so that more personal contact from four-year school representatives would be possible.

- Full Transfer Center services for evening students could increase the effectiveness of the program.

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The questionnaire was designed by the staff of the Los Rios Office of Planning and Research in consultation with the Transfer Center Program Director and with the Transfer Center Research Committee. It was then given to the UC Davis Reprographics Department for typesetting and printing.

The questionnaire was divided into three major segments. Section A included a variety of questions to determine how students first became aware of the Center and the ways in which they used it. Section B was designed to match closely the annual Los Rios student follow-up survey to allow us to compare results for those students who have completed transfer. (For reference, see the Measures of Progress series of reports by Beth S. Lee, 1984, 1985, and 1986.) In Section B, the questions asked students to indicate the college to which they transferred, to specify any problems encountered, and to rate their Los Rios preparation for transfer. The last part, Section C, asked questions concerning the college background of the student's family, the degree to which the student found the Center helpful, and how the Center might be improved. This section also provided space for additional comments, which were in fact offered by 42% of those returning the survey. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

DISTRIBUTION

The questionnaires were mailed to all students who had used the Centers directly during the first year of operation and who were listed in the student data file as clients. Two mailings were sent. The first went out during the week of November 24, and the second--to those who had not responded--during the week of December 15. Each mailing was sent with a cover letter from the Los Rios Chancellor explaining the importance of the survey. A copy of each of the letters is included in the Appendix. CSUS covered the cost of both outgoing mailings, while Los Rios covered the cost of return postage.

RESPONSE RATE

An adjusted response rate of 48.5% was achieved. While returns from the second mailing were being received, respondents indicated on several returns that they had not been in the Center. A check with the Centers revealed that two of them had entered names of

students into their files who had been presented with Transfer Center information and services at locations other than the Center. An examination of student records showed 135 of these students at American River and Cosumnes River colleges. These students were genuine contacts, but since they had not been in the Centers, they were removed from the respondent population. As a result of this situation, a new form of record keeping was approved so that the various types of contacts can more easily be differentiated and tabulated. The table below illustrates the calculations used to determine the response rate.

RESPONSE RATE

1,568	Names on the Mailing List
135	Names Removed because of Records Problem (See Explanation Above)
148	Undelivered Questionnaires
16	Responses Returned Blank
1,269	Adjusted Number of Surveys
284	Valid Responses from ARC
125	Valid Responses from CRC
207	Valid Responses from SCC
616	Total Valid Responses
48.5%	Adjusted Response Rate

DATA ANALYSIS

Responses were analyzed using SPSS-X, a computer software program developed by SPSS Inc. for use in social science and other types of research. Since we were dealing with a full survey population descriptive statistics were utilized rather than inferential.

SURVEY RESULTS

SECTION A

In the first section of the questionnaire we asked basic questions: how the respondents became aware of the Center, what services they used and how they rated them, what majors they had selected, what plans they had made for transfer, and what their current educational status was.

Question 1: Student Awareness of Transfer Center

The initial question asked students how they first became aware of the Transfer Center. Almost half (44%) of the respondents said they were introduced to the Transfer Center by a counselor. The next most frequent means of acquainting respondents with the Center was with Transfer Center publicity (19%), followed by help from a friend (11%), both far below the ratings given to counselor referral. The 7% of the respondents who cited "Other" most often commented that they found the Center by "walking by," while others indicated it was either a "combination of sources" that led them to the Center, or that they had read about the Centers in one of the local newspapers--reasons which could be interpreted as the effects of publicity. Some respondents said they were directed there by people they had contacted at one of the local universities. The table below presents the numbers and percentages of responses to each part of question A-1.

TABLE 1
AWARENESS
ITEM A-1

Question: How did you FIRST become aware of the Transfer Center?

SOURCE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Your visit to a counselor	43.5%	268
Transfer Center publicity	18.7%	115
Friend	10.7%	66
Other	6.7%	41
School paper	6.5%	40
Counselor class visit	6.2%	38
Instructor	5.2%	32
Transfer Center telephone call	1.1%	7
No Response	1.5%	9
Total	100.0%	616

Question 2: Ratings of Transfer Center Services

In this question, ten common Transfer Center activities were listed, and students were asked to rate the services they had used. Most respondents were clearly selective, although a few indicated they had used all the listed services, which seems unlikely. Interviews with university representatives and the use of university catalogs and background information were cited as the most frequently used services (72% and 75% respectively). The next most frequently used services were advice on general education and breadth requirements (67%), advice on major (65%), admission evaluation advising (58%), and application filing assistance (56%).

A significant majority of those using the above services rated them as either "good" or "very good." However, the ratings for advice on general education and breadth requirements and advice on choice of major were not as high as for the other four services. Both the response rate and the sense of satisfaction fell for the next three services: financial aid advising, housing information, and hot line information. Finally, although the numbers of people who responded to the questions concerning the campus tours were much smaller, the satisfaction was high, and these tours were not intentionally designed for large groups of students. The table below presents the results.

TABLE 2
SERVICES RATING
ITEM A-2
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU HAVE USED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER SERVICES, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 616

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
University catalogs and background info	74.8%	461	4.0
Interviews with university representatives	71.6%	441	4.1
Advice on General Ed/Breadth	67.0%	413	3.9
Advice on major	65.3%	402	3.7
Admission evaluation advising	57.8%	356	3.9
Application filing assistance	56.2%	346	3.9
Financial aid advising	42.2%	260	3.4
Housing information	31.7%	195	3.4
Hot line information	19.8%	122	3.3
Campus tour to:			
CSUS	16.1%	99	3.8
UCD	14.4%	89	4.0
UOP	6.2%	38	3.4

Question 3: Ratings of Transfer Center Workshops

The workshops and seminars conducted by the Transfer Centers offered more specialized information to prospective transfer students and, like the campus tours, were designed for a smaller audience, a fact which was reflected in the number of responses to this section. It should be noted, for example, that those who reported they attended a financial aid workshop were considerably more pleased than was the larger group responding to the previous question asking them to rate financial aid advice (see Table 2). On the other hand, it seems that the respondents were consistently less happy about housing information. Such lower ratings perhaps reflect the unfortunate reality of insufficient housing in all college neighborhoods more than the quality of information presented. The table below provides the results.

TABLE 3
WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS
ITEM A-3
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU PARTICIPATED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER WORKSHOPS OR SEMINARS, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 616

WORKSHOP OR SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
Application process	15.3%	94	4.1
Financial Aid	11.5%	71	3.8
Presentation by university professors	10.2%	63	3.8
Housing	5.8%	36	3.4

Question 4: Transfer Admission Agreement

The Transfer Admission Agreement was one of the first services established for students using the Transfer Centers. In the spring semester of 1986, the Los Rios District completed negotiations with UCD, UOP, and CSUS for a guarantee of admission to one of these three universities for Los Rios students once the student's progress has been evaluated by a counselor and a precise program for one or two additional semesters worked out. The student is guaranteed admission to the four-year school, so long as the necessary courses are completed and the requisite GPA is maintained. A total of 149 respondents indicated they had signed such an agreement: 3 with UOP; 61 with CSUS; and 85 with UCD. In addition, four respondents indicated they had signed an agreement but did not specify where, and three had signed an agreement with more than one school. The 33 who did not respond at all to this item can probably be assumed not to have signed a contract, since the value of such an agreement would be clear to those who had entered into it and it is likely they would acknowledge signing one. The table below presents the results.

TABLE 4
TRANSFER ADMISSION AGREEMENT
ITEM A-4

Question: Did you sign a Transfer Admission Agreement?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	24.2%	149
No	70.5%	434
No Response	5.4%	33
Total	100.0%	616

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 149)

UCD	57.0%	85
CSUS	40.9%	61
UOP	2.0%	3
No Response	2.1%	4
Total*	102.0%	153

*The total is greater than 100% because 3 people signed an agreement with more than one school.

Question 5: Anticipated Transfer Major

The most frequently cited transfer major was business, reported by 21% of the respondents. Engineering was second with 14%, and social science third at 10%. More than three quarters of the respondents indicated that the Center did not assist them in selecting their majors, although as previously noted in Table 2, the 65% who responded rated advice on major at 3.7 on a 5-point scale. It may be that the Transfer Centers are advising students who already have a good idea of what their major is going to be, with the advice simply further confirming their choice. The following table lists the respondents' majors and their response to whether the Center assisted them in this choice.

TABLE 5
ANTICIPATED TRANSFER MAJOR
ITEM A-5

Question: What is/was your anticipated transfer major?

MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	20.5%	126
Engineering	14.1%	87
Social and Behavioral Sciences	9.9%	61
Biological Sciences	8.1%	50
Education, Physical Education	6.0%	37
Fine and Applied Arts	5.2%	32
Physical Sciences	5.2%	32
English, Speech, Philosophy	3.9%	24
Health Professions	3.2%	20
Communications	2.9%	18
Mathematics	2.6%	16
Agriculture/Natural Resources	2.4%	15
Home Econ/Family & Consumer Sciences	2.4%	15
Computer and Information Science	2.3%	14
Protective and Social Services	1.9%	12
Foreign Languages	1.1%	7
Law	0.2%	1
Occupational and Trade Tech	0.2%	1
Undeclared or No Response	7.8%	48
Total	100.0%	616

Question: Did the Transfer Center assist you in this choice?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	19.0%	117
No	76.8%	473
No Response	4.2%	26
Total	100.0%	616

Question 6: Applying to a Four-year School

Over 60% of the respondents indicated they had applied to a four-year school, 30% said no, and 10% did not reply to the question. Unsolicited student comments on this question indicated that a number of the respondents had applied before talking with a representative (note the question specified "after") and had simply gone to the Centers for additional assistance; some of these students then responded "no" to the question. In any case, a significant majority of the survey respondents did apply to a four-year school, which is one of the outcomes the Transfer Center Project was and is seeking to promote.

While the greatest number of respondents (196) applied to one of the CSU campuses, almost as many (179) had applied to UC. In addition to these public institutions, 12 respondents applied to a private school, 5 indicated "Other," and an additional 5 did not specify their choice. The following table illustrates the responses.

TABLE 6
APPLYING FOR ADMISSION TO A FOUR-YEAR SCHOOL
ITEM A-6

Question: After talking with a university representative, did you apply for admission to a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	60.2%	371
No	29.5%	182
No Response	10.2%	63
Total	100.0%	616

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 371)

CSU	52.8%	196
UC	48.2%	179
Private	3.2%	12
Other	1.3%	5
No Response	1.3%	5
Total*	106.8%	397

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied to more than one school.

Question 7: Applying for Financial Aid

Fewer than a third of the respondents acknowledged applying for financial aid or scholarships at a four-year school. While more respondents indicated they had applied for admission to UC than to CSUS, considerably more applied for some kind of financial assistance at UC: 100 at UC compared to 79 at CSU. (Question 7, unlike the previous question, did not contain the phrase "after talking with a university representative." That only 4% did not respond to this question is perhaps an indication that more students had applied for admission than was indicated by the responses to Question 6 where 10% failed to respond.) The table which follows presents the results.

TABLE 7
FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION
ITEM A-7

Question: Have you applied for any financial aid or scholarships to help you further your education at a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	31.3%	193
No	64.8%	399
No Response	3.9%	24
Total	100.0%	616

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 193)

UC	51.8%	100
CSU	40.9%	79
Private	4.7%	9
Other	5.2%	10
No Response	1.6%	3
Total*	104.2%	201

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied for aid from more than one school.

Question 8: Current Educational Status

More than a third of those who responded to this question (35%) indicated that they were currently attending a four-year school. The next largest groups of respondents were still attending one of the three Los Rios Colleges: American River College (32%), Sacramento City College (17%), and Cosumnes River College (10%). In addition, 3% of the respondents indicated they had transferred but were not currently attending a university. Fewer than 2% stated that they had not transferred. The 3% who responded "Other" specified such reasons as maternity leave, attendance at another community college or vocational school, or waiting for a later start date at the four-year school.

Given that the Transfer Centers had been in operation only one year at the time of this survey, the large percentage (35%) who successfully transferred illustrates the seriousness of the group of students using the Transfer Centers. One student, who was still attending Sacramento City College, proudly included a photocopy of his letter of acceptance to UC Berkeley to prove that by the time the spring quarter began, he too could be counted as a transfer student.

While the table below shows the numbers and percentages of students answering this question, the next section of the report will look more closely at those students who have already transferred.

TABLE 8
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STATUS
ITEM A-8
Maximum Number = 616

Question: What is your CURRENT educational status?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Attending a four-year school	35.4%	218
Attending ARC	31.7%	195
Attending SCC	17.0%	105
Attending CRC	10.2%	63
Other	3.2%	20
Transferred, but not attending now	3.4%	21
Did not transfer	1.8%	11
No Response	0.6%	4
Total*	103.3%	637

*The total is greater than 100% because some students indicated they are attending more than one institution.

SECTION B

In this portion of the survey, only students who had already transferred to a four-year college were asked to rate their experiences with Los Rios. As many as 219 completed at least some part of this section, although not all respondents answered every item. The questions in this section were taken directly from the student follow-up survey used by Beth S. Lee for her annual Measures of Progress report--with the exception that this study asked only those students who had transferred to a four-year college to respond. For comparison purposes, results of Dr. Lee's 1986 report are included in the tables that accompany this section. While general comparisons can be made, please remember that the population she reported on is more than twice as large as that in this study, and her report examines students who transferred before the Transfer Centers were established. (Dr. Lee reports on all transfers, including those who transferred within the district or to other community colleges; however, for the Transfer Center study her results have been broken down to include just those respondents who were transfers to four-year schools. For that reason there may be small differences between the numbers reported here and those printed in her reports. For the complete report, see Measures of Progress: Spring 1985 Student Follow-up, Beth S. Lee, September, 1986.)

Question 1: Transfer College and Major

Not surprisingly, most of our students who responded transferred to one of the local universities. More than 54% had transferred to CSUS, and nearly 29% had transferred to UC Davis. UOP accounted for slightly more than 2% of the transfers. The table below illustrates the results.

TABLE 9
TRANSFER COLLEGE
ITEM B-1

Question: What is the name of your current (or most recently attended) college?

	TC SURVEY		MEASURES OF PROGRESS	
TRANSFER COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
CSU Sacramento	54.3%	119	67.8%	370
Other CSU Campus	6.4%	14	11.4%	62
UC Davis	28.8%	63	6.2%	34
Other UC Campus	6.4%	14	5.3%	29
University of the Pacific	2.3%	5	(See Note)	
Other California Independent	0.5%	1	6.4%	35
Outside California	1.4%	3	2.9%	16
Total	100.0%	219	100.0%	546

Note: UOP is included with California Independent Colleges in the Lee study.

The reported majors of those who transferred generally paralleled those reported in the first section of this report. Business (24%) was by far the most popular, with engineering second (11%). Social sciences and physical sciences were third (both 8%), followed by education and biological sciences (both 7%). The percentage of undeclared majors was smaller than that indicated by the entire survey group who answered a similar question in Section A (see Table 5, Anticipated Transfer Majors). The various majors of those who responded to this question are summarized in the table below.

TABLE 10
ACTUAL TRANSFER MAJOR
ITEM B-1

Question: What is your major field of study?

	TC SURVEY		MEASURES OF PROGRESS	
MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	24.2%	53	23.7%	129
Engineering	11.4%	25	8.1%	44
Physical Sciences	7.8%	17	1.3%	7
Social and Behavioral Sciences	7.8%	17	11.7%	64
Biological Sciences	6.8%	15	4.4%	24
Education/Physical Education	6.8%	15	5.0%	27
Fine and Applied Arts*	6.8%	15	4.4%	24
Communications/Journalism	5.0%	11	7.2%	39
English/Speech/Philosophy	4.1%	9	2.6%	14
Protective and Social Services	3.2%	7	4.2%	23
Foreign Languages	2.7%	6	-	-
Home Ec/Family & Consumer Science	2.7%	6	3.3%	18
Agriculture/Natural Resources	1.8%	4	0.7%	4
Computer and Information Science	1.8%	4	5.1%	28
Health Professions	1.4%	3	5.1%	28
Mathematics	1.4%	3	1.3%	7
General Education-Interdisciplinary	-	-	0.4%	2
Law	-	-	5.3%	29
Library Science	-	-	1.3%	7
Occupational and Trade Tech	-	-	0.6%	3
Undeclared	4.1%	9	4.4%	24
Total	100.0%	219	100.0%	545

*Includes Architecture and Environmental Design

Question 2: Problems with Transfer

Nearly 73% of those responding to this section reported no problems in transferring to a four-year school. However, with more than one in four indicating at least some problems, it is important to look at what difficulties those 58 people encountered. More than half of these respondents said they had problems with transcripts, while 25 people cited problems transferring units. Twelve people indicated they had admission problems, and eleven indicated "Other" problems such as financial aid or other records lost, or problems with the general education pattern. Some problems with transfer invariably occur, and one of the goals of the Transfer Center Program is to help minimize them. That these percentages are higher than those reported in the last Measures of Progress survey is a concern, but since in this report small numbers of students are involved, a shift of one or two people can produce significant differences in percentages. The results are presented in the table below.

TABLE 11
PROBLEMS IN TRANSFERRING
TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
ITEM B-2

Question: Did you have any problems transferring to the college indicated above?

	TC SURVEY		MEASURES OF PROGRESS	
PROBLEM?	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
No	72.9%	156	87.0%	470
Yes	27.1%	58	13.0%	70
Total	100.0%	214	100.0%	540
TYPE OF PROBLEM	(Max Number = 58)		(Max Number = 70)	
Transferring Units	11.7%	25	4.6%	25
Transcript Problems	13.6%	29	6.1%	33
Admission Problems	5.6%	12	1.7%	9
Other Transfer Problems	5.1%	11	2.2%	12

Percentages for the types of problems reported were calculated by using the total number of respondents to this section.

Question 3: Units Lost in Transfer

Three-fourths of the 200 respondents to this question reported they lost some units during transfer. Still, one quarter reported they lost no units in transfer, and nearly the same number reported losing between seven and twelve units. Eighteen people reported they lost 22 or more units. Determining why three-fourths of the transferred students lost units would require an individual analysis of each transcript, but one possibility is that many community college students are not initially eligible for a university when they begin their college studies and consequently require additional course work before taking transfer classes. It is also possible that some students decided to take non-transfer or vocational courses for various reasons, knowing full well these courses would not transfer to a university. The table below presents the results.

TABLE 12
UNITS ACCEPTED
ITEM B-3

Question: How many units earned at our college were not accepted at the college to which you transferred?

	TC SURVEY		MEASURES OF PROGRESS	
UNITS ACCEPTED/LOST	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
All Units Accepted	25.0%	50	33.4%	170
Lost 1 - 3 Units	14.5%	29	18.9%	96
Lost 4 - 6 Units	17.0%	34	14.9%	76
Lost 7 - 12 Units	23.5%	47	16.5%	84
Lost 13 - 21 Units	11.0%	22	8.3%	42
Lost 22 or More Units	9.0%	18	8.1%	41
Total	100.0%	200	100.0%	509

Question 4: Transfer Status

Once the respondents transferred, the majority became full-time students with only 15% indicating that they were attending the four-year school part time. This response is of particular interest since the Los Rios student profile is decidedly part-time. (See the Planning for Change series, and Fall 1986 Enrollment Update: Trends and Implications, Janis Cox Coffey and Randall D. Jones, January, 1987.) In fact, 64% of the people who responded to this question stated that they took fewer than twelve units during their last semester at one of the Los Rios colleges; so it is clear that one of the major changes these students experienced with transfer was the change from being a part-time student to being a full-time one. The table below presents a summary of the results of these two questions.

TABLE 13
STATUS/CLASSIFICATION
AT FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
ITEM B-4

Question: If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

	TC SURVEY		MEASURES OF PROGRESS	
STATUS	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Full-time (12 or more units)	84.8%	179	76.5%	385
Part-time (Fewer than 12 units)	15.2%	32	23.5%	118
Total	100.0%	211	100.0%	503
CLASSIFICATION				
Freshman	1.9%	4	0.8%	4
Sophomore	10.0%	21	3.0%	15
Junior	81.0%	171	73.8%	372
Senior	4.3%	9	18.8%	95
Graduate Student	2.8%	6	3.6%	18
Total	100.0%	211	100.0%	504

The majority of students who had transferred (81%) reported they entered with junior standing at the four-year school. However, it was also interesting to note that a few people stated they were seniors or graduate students, suggesting they were returning students who used the Los Rios colleges to complete general education or lower division requirements before returning to a four-year school. This "reverse transfer" phenomenon has been studied by the district (See The Reverse Transfer Student: An Emerging Population, Nancy K. Renkiewicz, et al, 1982) and is one that helps create exciting classroom experiences for both the faculty and the more "traditional" community college students.

Question 5: Rating the Los Rios Preparation

In spite of any problems encountered when transferring or the number of units lost, the great majority of students who responded to this section of the survey rated the preparation they received at the Los Rios colleges very high. More than 80% indicated their preparation was satisfactory to excellent, and the overall average rating was 4.2 on a 5-point scale. The table below summarizes the ratings.

TABLE 14
RATING FOR PREPARATION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
ITEM B-5
Ratings: 5 = Excellent . . . 1 = Inadequate

Question: How well did the course you completed at our college prepare you for continuing your education?

	TC SURVEY		MEASURES OF PROGRESS	
EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Preparation Was Excellent (5)	43.5%	93	36.9%	195
Preparation Was Satisfactory (4)	36.9%	79	40.5%	214
Good in Some Areas Only (3)	14.5%	31	19.1%	101
Fair; All Could Have Been Better (2)	1.9%	4	3.0%	16
Preparation Was Inadequate (1)	3.3%	7	0.6%	3
Total	100.0%	214	100.0%	529
Average Rating	4.2		4.1	

SECTION C

As in Section A, all students were asked to complete Section C of the survey, and most did so. They were requested to provide information concerning the college background of family members and then to assess the value of the Center by responding to the question of whether they thought other transfer oriented students would benefit from its assistance. In addition, space was provided at the end of this section for additional comments, and 42% of the respondents made sometimes extensive comments, occasionally adding an extra sheet of paper.

Question 1: Family College Background

Because family support can be such an important factor in student success in college, the survey sought to determine if other family members had also attended college. Almost 17% of all respondents came from families with no other college experience, not even for siblings. Of the 499 who indicated that other family members had some college experience, 58% responded that their father attended college, 49% said their mother had done so, and 39% reported both parents had gone to college. On the other hand, 20% of those who reported that family members had college experience indicated that their spouse had attended college--suggesting perhaps a more mature respondent than is commonly pictured as a college student. Certainly the 5% who said their own children had attended college remind us that the community colleges now generally serve many older and working adults in addition to students of "traditional" college age. The table below reports the results of this question. Table 16, which follows, illustrates the calculations used to determine that 43% of the respondents were first generation-college students.

TABLE 15
FAMILY COLLEGE BACKGROUND
ITEM C-1

Question: Has anyone in your immediate family attended college?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	81.0%	499
No	16.6%	102
No Response	2.4%	15
Total	100.0%	616

Question: If yes, who? (Maximum Number = 499)

RELATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Sibling	70.7%	353
Father	57.5%	287
Mother	49.1%	245
Both Mother and Father	39.3%	196
Spouse	19.8%	99
Children	5.2%	26

TABLE 16
FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE CALCULATION

No other family member attended college	102
Other family member attended, but not parent(s)	163
Total	265
Percentage of 616 returned surveys	43.0%

One limitation is that this question did not ask how much college experience the other family members have had. Because that experience could range from obtaining a doctorate at a prestigious university to taking a class or two at a community college, the 43% who reported first-generation college status is significant, since it is those students whose background might not "naturally" include college that the Transfer Center Project was designed to assist.

Question 2: Rating the Transfer Center's Helpfulness for Others

One clear measure of a program's success lies in the percentage of people who would recommend that others use it. By that measure the Transfer Center Project has been successful. Of those who responded, more than 81% thought the center would be helpful or very helpful to others who might use it. The overall average rating was 4.3 on a 5-point scale.

TABLE 17
TRANSFER CENTER HELPFULNESS FOR OTHERS
ITEM C-2
Ratings: 5 = Very Helpful . . . 1 = Unnecessary

Question: How helpful do you feel Transfer Center assistance would be for OTHER transfer-oriented students?

EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Very Helpful (5)	48.7%	300
Helpful (4)	32.8%	202
Possibly Helpful (3)	13.0%	80
Not Helpful (2)	1.8%	11
Unnecessary (1)	0.3%	2
No Response	3.4%	21
Total	100.0%	616
Average Rating of 595 Responses	4.3	

In addition to the high rating reflected in the previous table, student comments also clearly reflected the fact that the respondents felt the services offered by the Transfer Centers were valuable. Those comments will be analyzed in the next section of this report.

Question 3: Suggestions for Improvement

Since one of the principle reasons for conducting this survey was to look at areas where service could be improved for the third year of the project, clients themselves were asked what they thought would be most helpful. The representatives from the four-year schools were in greatest demand, with more than 45% of those who turned in the survey asking for more personal contact from university representatives. Nearly the same percentage asked for on-the-spot admission evaluation, even though the questionnaire made it clear that such an evaluation would be unofficial. The third most common request was for more printed information and publications from the four-year schools, with 41% asking for such assistance. Even though the library of transfer publications was the most often used service according to the responses in Section A (see Table 2), students would still like to see a more complete collection. After an on-the-spot (but unofficial) financial aid calculation which was requested by 35% of the respondents, the demand for other services fell. Still, more than one in four asked for evening coverage--a significant percentage since the respondents were students who used a service that was available primarily during the day. In fact, some students who identified themselves as evening students commented that it was difficult to take time off work in the afternoon to have an appointment in the Center, but that they did so because they thought the service was valuable. A summary of the suggested improvements appears in the table below.

TABLE 18
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS
ITEM C-3

Question: What suggestions would you give for Transfer Center improvement?
Maximum Number = 616

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
More PERSONAL contact from four-year school reps	45.1%	278
On-the-spot admission evaluation (unofficial)	44.8%	276
More university information and publications	41.4%	255
On-the-spot financial aid calculation (estimate)	35.4%	218
More participation by UNIVERSITY faculty	33.0%	203
Evening Coverage (5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.)	26.1%	161
More participation by OUR college faculty	20.6%	127
Additional workshops*	8.0%	49
Other*	13.8%	85

*For a review of suggestions for workshops and of other suggestions see the next section of this report, pages 22-23.

STUDENT COMMENTS

Respondents were given three opportunities to write their own comments. In Item C-3, just discussed, 8% offered suggestions for additional workshops and 14% offered "other" short suggestions. Item C-4 left a third of a page open for additional comments, and more than 42% (or 261) of the returns contained comments, some of them extensive. As the questionnaires were prepared for computer analysis, all comments were reviewed in the Office of Planning and Research, but the more formal analysis was completed at UC Davis by Gary Tudor and Bernard Yaklin, and the tables that follow reflect their work.

Suggestions for Additional Workshops

The requests for additional workshops showed five major concerns: academic, financial, admission, transition and miscellaneous. When these were broken down more specifically, it was interesting to note that the greatest number (18) dealt with advice on majors. Even though earlier (in Table 5) it was shown that the Transfer Centers did not greatly influence a student's choice of major, there were still some people who specifically asked for such assistance. Some of the other requests for workshops were for those that had already been provided (such as financial aid, scholarships, admission evaluation, and housing); this might suggest that more publicity is needed, or that additional workshops should be scheduled to minimize conflict with student schedules. Table 19, below, presents a summary of the suggestions for additional workshops.

TABLE 19
SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL WORKSHOPS
ITEM C-3, PART H

		Number
Academic Concerns:	Advising on specific majors	14
	Course selection in majors	4
	General Studies requirements	4
	Community college graduation requirements	1
Financial Concerns:	Financial aid	8
	Scholarships	2
Admission Concerns:	Application filing & admission evaluation	4
	Writing the essay for UC admission	2
Transition Concerns:	Transition to four-year campuses	3
	Housing	3
	Reentry	2
	Disabled services	1
	Child care	1
Miscellaneous Concerns:	Career goals	3
	Tours	2
	Services of Transfer Center	1
Total Suggestions:		55

The total number of suggestions (55) does not reflect the total in Table 18 because some students suggested more than one additional workshop.

Other Suggestions

As with the workshop suggestions, some of the suggestions for other services were for those already provided, but this might be interpreted as an overall request for expanded services. Again, the most commonly requested service dealt with advice on majors, but better publicity was also one of the suggestions. The table below gives a summary of these suggestions.

TABLE 20
OTHER SUGGESTIONS
ITEM C-3, PART I

		Number
Academic Concerns:	Have more specific information about transfer, particularly majors	20
	More information on breadth and lower division requirements	8
Expanded Services:	More information on other colleges, including representatives and catalogs	12
	Transfer Admission Agreements with other UC's	2
Counseling Concerns:	More hours from counselors and four-year reps	12
	More knowledgeable community college counselors	5
	Counseling for evening students	2
	More caring four-year reps	1
	Talks with business people about majors & careers	1
Publicity:	Better publicity about services	8
	Distribute calendar with four-year visit schedules	2
	Start a transfer club	1
Transition Concerns:	More contact with four-year faculty	4
	Talks with students from four-year colleges	2
	Tours to four-year campuses	1
	Video of four year classes	1
Financial Concerns:	Early and accurate financial aid calculation	3
Total Suggestions:		85

Question 4: Additional Comments

The last section of the survey provided the respondents with the opportunity to make additional comments if they wished, and 261 or 42% of the respondents did so. In some instances they might be an echo of the suggestions above, but many provided insights about the operation of the Centers. Most of the comments were overwhelmingly positive, although occasionally some cited specific problems. These open ended responses were also analyzed at UC Davis, and a summary is provided in Table 21.

The UC Davis representative was specifically singled out for praise by many. The approach used by UC Davis with the Transfer Centers is different from that used by CSUS and UOP because Davis has a single representative who divides her time among the Los Rios colleges and whose salary is equally funded by Los Rios and UCD. The other two universities, while having full representation, have employed different people on different schedules. The value of having one consistent representative from each university is clear.

A typical comment was a request for more university representatives or for more time per student interview session. Also noteworthy were the requests for additional information about other campuses, more financial aid information, and requests for evening coverage. Several interesting comments were received asking for a more demanding scholastic program to prepare Los Rios students more realistically for transfer. Of course there were also mentions of some problems that students encountered, most of which were specific and individual. Copies of the comments will be given to the directors of each of the Transfer Centers to consider. If the comment suggested an immediate problem, a copy was given to the Program Director for immediate follow-up before this report was produced. Since the tone of most of the comments was highly positive, what follows are typical examples while Table 21 on the next page offers a more formal summary of the comments:

- "I think the Transfer Center is an excellent service. It helps take away a lot of the guess work and worry."

- "The Transfer Center at Sacramento City College has helped me greatly. The Center has been helpful in choosing the right campus and even in filling out my application. The biggest asset in this program is the transfer guarantee agreement. It has taken a lot of stress and wondering out of applying."

- "Much more advertisement. The benefits of the center to all students are so great that its activities should be spotlighted."

- "There is a tremendous gap between the intensity of a community college and at U.C. I feel this is a fact felt by all transfer students I have encountered. Students should be forewarned. I was minimally warned, but the matter has definitely been handled much too lightly."

- "I have a full time job and it is not possible for me to come in during the day. If there could be Transfer Center hours in the evening it would be useful."

- "I feel it is necessary to maintain the Transfer Center if the State's objective is to make available to community college students a readily accessible source of transfer procedure information."

- "Thanks for being there!"

TABLE 21
SURVEY OF ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
ITEM C-4

Question: We would appreciate any additional comments regarding how we could improve the services we have provided. Please use the space below for your comments.

TYPES OF COMMENTS	ORIGIN OF COMMENTS ARC	CRC	SCC
1. General Comments			
Praise	38	20	39
Problem	10	3	5
2. University Representatives			
UC System Representatives			
Praise directed specifically to Linda Case	12	4	14
Other Praise	5	4	4
Problem	4	-	2
CSU System Representatives			
Praise	10	3	4
Problem	9	2	4
UOP/Private System Representatives			
Praise	1	-	1
Problem	1	-	-
Requests for More University Representatives	8	2	10
Requests for More Time per Student	5	-	4
3. Los Rios Counselors			
Praise	9	3	10
Problem	9	6	5
4. Awareness of Transfer Center			
Limited	11	2	8
Not Aware	2	1	1
Confused with TOP*	2	-	1
5. Desire More Information About Other Campuses			
UC System	7	1	3
CSU System	2	-	2
Private Systems	2	-	-
6. Financial Aid			
More information	2	1	2
Problem	2	-	1
7. Requests for Additional Services			
Evening Coverage	2	-	3
8. More Demanding Scholastic Programs	2	2	-

*TOP = Transfer Opportunity Program, an earlier transfer program sponsored by LRCCD and UCD.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The student identification numbers of those in the survey population were matched with those on the Los Rios student transcript file to obtain information concerning age, sex, ethnicity, educational goal, grade point average, citizenship, and units attempted and completed. In addition, the student's credit load during the last semester attended (whether Fall 1985, Spring 1986, or Fall 1986) was examined.

The demographic breakdown of those who used the Centers presents some intriguing questions. Why did certain groups use the Centers more than others? Are there certain characteristics among students, excluding ethnicity, that make them desire the services provided by the Transfer Centers? Does the fact that the Centers served primarily day students account for certain demographic characteristics? Are we serving all who need help and who are genuinely pursuing transfer?

Ethnicity Compared to District Figures

Ethnic minorities used the Centers in proportions greater than their district-wide population percentages, while white students made up the majority of Transfer Center clients even though they did not use the Centers in proportion to their percentage in the district's overall student population. Asians, on the other hand, used the Centers nearly twice as frequently as their district-wide population would suggest. Among the first-generation college students, the percentage of whites was lower than in the survey population as a whole and the percentage of Asians was much higher. In fact, Asians represented more than one in four of the first-generation clients. Hispanics in the survey population were very close in proportion to their district population, and increased to more than 10% of the first-generation group. American Indians were generally consistent in proportion in all areas. It is with the black students that we see a drop in percentage from district totals. The drop was even greater if we look at black males, for only one black male was reported in the totals of first-generation college students. (See the next set of tables.) However, the reader must keep in mind that blacks were slightly over represented in the survey population. While they had been in the Centers, in general they did not return the surveys.

The following table presents three aspects of the survey population (the survey population, respondents, and respondents identified as first-generation college students) compared to the Fall 1985 and Fall 1986 district populations. While the percentages allow for easy comparisons, since we are examining small populations in this survey a difference of only a few people can change the percentages significantly.

TABLE 22
ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	Survey Population N=1,548	Respondent Population N=605	First-Generation Population N=259	Fall 1985 District Population N=37,764	Fall 1986 District Population N=40,427
White	57.6%	61.5%	49.8%	66.3%	67.2%
Asian	17.1%	18.0%	25.9%	9.7%	9.7%
Hispanic	8.3%	7.4%	10.8%	7.7%	7.7%
Black	9.5%	5.8%	4.6%	8.8%	8.0%
American Indian	1.8%	1.8%	2.3%	1.9%	2.1%
Other	3.2%	2.8%	3.5%	2.9%	2.9%
Not Coded	2.5%	2.6%	3.1%	2.8%	2.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Missing Observations: Survey Population = 20; Respondents = 11; First-Generation = 6.
The ethnicity of these students is unavailable since they were not registered Los Rios students.

Age, Sex, and Ethnicity

The three tables that follow present the age, sex, and ethnicity breakdowns of the same three groups as discussed above: the survey population, the respondents, and those respondents who were identified as first-generation college students. Since the numbers are not large, the percentages may be somewhat misleading and for that reason were not calculated.

Women made up the majority of most populations, with some notable exceptions. In the "traditional" college age group of 18-24 year olds, men were generally the majority for all ethnic groups except blacks. Asians were the only ethnic group where men generally outnumbered the women, and this was especially true in the 18-24 year old group. There was a significant number of white women between ages 30-39, which was generally not the case for other ethnic groups. As a group, the first-generation college students again presented a predominately female profile, except for Asians where males generally dominated. The largest single group in this subpopulation of first-generation students was white women between the ages of 30-39. Finally, the most striking difference between the numbers of males and females was seen among blacks where, in the first-generation college population, women outnumbered men eleven to one.

TABLE 23
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
SURVEY POPULATION

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	7 - 7	247 - 252	85 - 85	112 - 42	38 - 16	489 - 402
Asian	6 - 2	89 - 110	18 - 14	8 - 10	2 - 6	123 - 142
Hispanic	1 - 0	36 - 40	10 - 12	15 - 4	5 - 5	67 - 61
Black	1 - 0	48 - 32	23 - 13	9 - 6	10 - 5	91 - 56
American Indian	1 - 0	4 - 3	5 - 6	4 - 2	2 - 1	16 - 12
Other	2 - 0	9 - 18	4 - 6	3 - 6	0 - 2	18 - 32
Not Coded	1 - 0	10 - 9	2 - 6	2 - 2	5 - 2	20 - 19
Total	19 - 9	443 - 464	147 - 142	153 - 72	62 - 37	824 - 724

Total Population: 1548
Missing Observations: 20 (see Table 22)

TABLE 24
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENT POPULATION

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	3 - 3	99 - 102	33 - 34	53 - 17	20 - 8	208 - 164
Asian	1 - 1	42 - 45	8 - 3	2 - 3	1 - 3	54 - 55
Hispanic	1 - 0	10 - 17	4 - 4	6 - 0	3 - 0	24 - 21
Black	0 - 0	11 - 5	9 - 3	1 - 0	5 - 1	26 - 9
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 2	4 - 1	3 - 1	0 - 0	7 - 4
Other	1 - 0	4 - 5	2 - 0	0 - 4	0 - 1	7 - 10
Not Coded	1 - 0	4 - 5	2 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 2	7 - 9
Total	7 - 4	170 - 181	62 - 46	65 - 26	29 - 15	333 - 272

Total Population: 605
Missing Observations: 11 (see Table 22)

TABLE 25
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 1	22 - 23	12 - 14	32 - 8	12 - 5	78 - 51
Asian	1 - 1	21 - 27	5 - 3	2 - 3	1 - 3	30 - 37
Hispanic	0 - 0	4 - 12	3 - 3	4 - 0	2 - 0	13 - 15
Black	0 - 0	4 - 1	3 - 0	0 - 0	4 - 0	11 - 1
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 2	1 - 0	2 - 1	0 - 0	3 - 3
Other	0 - 0	1 - 3	2 - 0	0 - 2	0 - 1	3 - 6
Not Coded	1 - 0	1 - 3	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 2	2 - 6
Total	2 - 2	51 - 65	28 - 29	40 - 15	19 - 11	140 - 119

Total Population: 259
Missing Observations: 6 (see Table 22)

Age, Sex, and Ethnicity: Another View

Previous tables included information on the entire survey populations. The following demographic tables include only the respondents to the questionnaire. This group was further broken down to allow for a comparison between those who had transferred and those who had not at the time of the survey. One more view of the age, sex, and ethnicity tables continues to illustrate many of the observations just made. The 18-24 year age group was still the most heavily represented, and women continued to predominate. What is notable is that the breakdown for those respondents who had transferred reveals that Asian women, particularly in the 18-24 year old group, outnumbered men, while the reverse was true in earlier observations. The two tables that follow illustrate these additional breakdowns.

TABLE 26
AGE AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: NOT YET TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	1 - 3	62 - 66	24 - 23	39 - 10	11 - 5	137 - 107
Asian	1 - 0	21 - 35	3 - 2	1 - 3	0 - 1	26 - 41
Hispanic	1 - 0	7 - 8	4 - 2	2 - 0	1 - 0	15 - 10
Black	0 - 0	9 - 2	5 - 3	1 - 0	4 - 1	19 - 6
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	4 - 1	2 - 1	0 - 0	6 - 3
Other	1 - 0	2 - 4	1 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 1	4 - 6
Not Coded	1 - 0	1 - 2	2 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 2	4 - 5
Total	5 - 3	102 - 111	43 - 32	45 - 15	16 - 10	211 - 178

Total Population: 389
Missing Observations: 8 (see Table 22)

TABLE 27
AGE AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	2 - 0	37 - 36	9 - 11	14 - 7	9 - 3	71 - 57
Asian	0 - 1	21 - 10	5 - 1	1 - 0	1 - 2	28 - 14
Hispanic	0 - 0	3 - 9	0 - 2	4 - 0	2 - 0	9 - 11
Black	0 - 0	2 - 3	4 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	7 - 3
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 1
Other	0 - 0	2 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 3	0 - 0	3 - 4
Not Coded	0 - 0	3 - 3	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	3 - 4
Total	2 - 1	68 - 63	19 - 14	20 - 11	13 - 5	122 - 94

Total Population: 216
Missing Observations: 3 (see Table 22)

All of the tables that follow continue to compare respondents who had transferred and those who had not, and some intriguing differences appeared which may help the Transfer Centers target their activities toward specific groups.

Citizenship

Although most of the respondents were U. S. citizens, still more than one in ten were not. (This proportion was higher at Sacramento City College; see College Tables.) Citizenship status is always changing, however, as a number of foreign and refugee students constantly apply for and receive citizenship. The table below illustrates the figures.

TABLE 28
DECLARED CITIZENSHIP

	Respondents Not Transferred N=397	Respondents Transferred N=219
U. S. Citizen	86.9%	87.7%
Permanent Student Visa	6.3%	7.3%
Refugee Visa	3.5%	0.5%
Student Visa (F-1)	1.0%	2.7%
Other Visa	0.3%	-
Missing	2.0%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Educational Goal

Not surprisingly, student records indicate most respondents declared a transfer goal when they first enrolled in a Los Rios college. What is surprising was that nearly 16% of those who transferred indicated they were originally attending for a vocational degree, and more than 18% indicated a general education (AA) degree as their initial goal. In fact, more than 40% of the respondents who had transferred did not indicate transfer as their goal when they first enrolled at Los Rios. At this point, Los Rios students are not asked to update their educational goals each semester they enroll, although methods of obtaining this information are under consideration. Given these survey results, it seems important that Transfer Center services not be limited only to those students who declare an intention to transfer. The table below lists the respondents' educational goals upon admission to Los Rios.

TABLE 29
EDUCATIONAL GOAL AT ADMISSION

	Respondents Not Transferred N=397	Respondents Transferred N=219
Transfer with Degree	45.8%	37.0%
Transfer without Degree	27.5%	21.5%
Vocational Degree	9.3%	15.5%
General Education Degree	7.6%	18.3%
No Objective	4.8%	5.5%
Vocational Certification	2.0%	-
Upgrade Job Skills	0.8%	0.5%
Acquire Job Skills	0.3%	0.5%
Missing	2.3%	1.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

(It is important to note that students are not asked to update their educational goals each semester they register.)

Unit Load

An examination of the number of units attempted and completed for each respondent's most recent semester revealed two important facts. First, the unit completion rate among these students was particularly high compared to the student population as a whole: while some did complete fewer units than they originally attempted, the difference in percentage was very small. Second, although the majority of these students were part-time students, they were still more likely than the district population as a whole to be taking twelve or more units. In the district, in the fall of 1986, 23% attempted 12 or more units (full-time students); 32% attempted 6 - 11.5 units (mid-load students); and 45% attempted fewer than 6 units (light-load students). (Source: Fall 1986 Enrollment Update: Trends and Implications, Coffey and Jones, January, 1987.) Although those respondents who transferred were less likely to take a full load during their last semester at Los Rios than were those who had not yet transferred, they too enrolled for more units than the average Los Rios student. The table below indicates the respondents' unit load.

TABLE 30
UNIT LOAD FOR MOST RECENT SEMESTER

	Respondents Not Transferred N=389		Respondents Transferred N=216	
	Attempted	Completed	Attempted	Completed
12 or More Units	44.2%	43.2%	36.1%	35.6%
6 - 11.5 Units	34.7%	34.2%	28.7%	28.8%
Fewer than 6 Units	21.1%	22.6%	35.2%	35.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cumulative Units Completed

It is clear if one looks at the number of units the survey respondents completed that more than half did not (or will not) follow the "traditional" two years of four fifteen-unit semesters before transfer. Almost a quarter of those who had already transferred had accumulated 45 units or less before transfer, indicating perhaps that they were eligible (or nearly so) for a four-year school before they entered Los Rios. More than a quarter of those transferred had accumulated more than 75 units, and of those who had not yet transferred, more than 34% had already accumulated more than 60 units. This pattern is outlined in the following table.

TABLE 31
CUMULATIVE UNITS COMPLETED

	Respondents Not Transferred N=389	Respondents Transferred N=216
0.0 - 15 Units	11.3%	4.6%
15.5 - 30 Units	11.1%	10.2%
30.5 - 45 Units	21.0%	8.8%
45.5 - 60 Units	22.2%	19.9%
60.5 - 75 Units	18.5%	29.6%
More Than 75 Units	15.9%	26.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

It is possible that some students needed additional preparation before beginning college-level work, or that they changed majors, or that they simply wanted additional courses. Such a large percentage of people who had completed more than 60 units could begin to explain why those respondents who had transferred reported they lost units in transfer, and since most of those people reported no transfer problems and rated their Los Rios preparation high, we might infer that the majority desired additional preparation before transfer. A number of questions could (and should) be raised here, although an individual examination of each respondent's transcript would be required to explain this pattern.

Grade Point Average

Those respondents who transferred and those not yet transferred had, for the most part, respectable grade point averages. For both groups, the median and the mean were both above 3.0, although those who had already transferred had slightly stronger averages as the table below illustrates.

TABLE 32
CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

	Respondents Not Transferred N=389	Respondents Transferred N=215
Median	3.08	3.21
Mean	3.04	3.12

CONCLUSIONS

The students who responded to the questionnaire offered a clearly positive judgment of the Transfer Center efforts. They were pleased with the counseling and information provided, and if there were complaints, they were frequently expressed as a request for more service, specifically more university representatives and an expanded library of university publications. In fact, more than 81% of the respondents indicated they thought other students would find the services helpful or very helpful, and satisfied clients should help increase the numbers of students seeking help.

The demographic profiles of the survey population and of the respondents did not show overwhelming percentages of ethnic minorities, but ethnic minorities--especially Asians--generally were represented in higher percentages than in the student population of the district as a whole. What is significant is the high percentage of first-generation college students, again especially among the Asians. Older white women also were represented in relatively large numbers among the Transfer Center clientele. These findings would suggest the Centers reached students who benefitted from and needed the services offered. If that conclusion is coupled with the overwhelmingly positive written comments and frequent requests for expanded services, those people responsible for providing Transfer Center assistance should feel pleased.

The question of expanded services, however, is a complex one since all such expansions invariably cost money. Full service to evening students is an often-expressed goal in many areas, not for just the Transfer Center, but it is a goal that needs to be pursued for the Transfer Center. Full-time university admission representatives such as the one supplied through the cooperation between Los Rios and UCD would make the links between the Los Rios colleges and other universities stronger. Finally, since in the most simple terms, the Transfer Center Project was designed to encourage and assist students--who might not see a university degree as a possibility--to plan for transfer, attention needs to be paid to making all students aware of the Transfer Center. Since more than 40% of the respondents who had transferred did not originally indicate a transfer goal when they entered Los Rios, there is a strong indication that the colleges are already helping to expand student goals, but that high figure also demonstrates that Transfer Center efforts cannot be limited only to new students who express an interest in transfer when they register. Meeting with and advising more students, however, requires additional counseling support, and if those requests for advice on majors are to be met, that additional support could be considerable.

The Transfer Center Project, therefore, is similar to all educational efforts: much good has been accomplished, yet much more is possible.

REFERENCES

_____. A Plan for Implementing the Transfer Center Pilot Program. California Community Colleges, the University of California, and the California State University. April, 1985.

Coffey, Janis Cox, and Randall D. Jones. Fall 1986 Enrollment Update: Trends and Implications. Sacramento, CA: Office of Planning and Research, Los Rios Community College District. January, 1987.

Lee, Beth S. Measures of Progress: Spring 1985 Student Follow-up. Sacramento, CA: Office of Planning and Research, Los Rios Community College District. September, 1986.

Renkiewicz, Nancy K. et al. The Reverse Transfer: An Emerging Population. Sacramento, CA: Los Rios Community College District and the Northern California Cooperative Institutional Research Group. 1982.

COLLEGE TABLES

For the most part, the results of the survey were similar when the responses from the three colleges were tabulated separately; however, in certain areas the colleges' natural diversity was also evident. The list below highlights some differences, and an examination of the college tables which follow will undoubtedly reveal more to those familiar with the individual characteristics of each college.

- While counselor referral was the most effective means of acquainting the respondents with Transfer Center services, CRC showed a much greater effect of publicity, and SCC respondents were more likely to acknowledge the assistance of a friend in introducing them to the Center.
- CRC and SCC respondents were more likely to have completed transfer than those from ARC.
- ARC respondents were more likely to be oriented toward UCD while those from CRC and SCC looked more often to CSUS for transfer.
- A greater percentage of respondents from CRC and SCC reported using the various Transfer Center services than did those from ARC.
- SCC respondents were least likely to report units lost during transfer.
- ARC respondents who transferred were more likely to have completed more than 75 units before transfer.
- While Most respondents who transferred reported attending the transfer university full time, those from ARC were most likely to be full time students.
- All respondents rated their Los Rios preparation high, but ARC transfer respondents seemed the most satisfied.
- CRC respondents were the most likely to be first generation college students; those form ARC the least.
- While ethnic minorities were represented above their population percentages at all three colleges, SCC and CRC respondents showed more ethnic minority participation than did ARC; SCC's high percentage of Asian first generation college students is particularly encouraging.
- White women, particularly those between the ages of 30-39, were represented in significant numbers at all three colleges.
- SCC's respondents were more likely to be non-citizens.
- Respondents from CRC were most likely to have originally declared a transfer goal.
- Respondents from CRC who had not transferred were more likely to have fewer than 15 units when appearing in the center.

TABLES
AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

ARC
TABLE 1
AWARENESS
ITEM A-1

Question: How did you FIRST become aware of the Transfer Center?

SOURCE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Your visit to a counselor	49.6%	141
Transfer Center publicity	16.2%	46
Friend	9.2%	26
Other	6.3%	18
School paper	5.3%	15
Counselor class visit	7.0%	20
Instructor	2.8%	8
Transfer Center telephone call	2.1%	6
No Response	1.4%	4
Total	100.0%	284

ARC
TABLE 2
SERVICES RATING
ITEM A-2
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU HAVE USED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER SERVICES, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 284

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
University catalogs and background info	77.5%	220	4.0
Interviews with university representatives	70.4%	200	4.1
Advice on General Ed/Breadth	66.2%	188	3.8
Advice on major	62.7%	178	3.7
Admission evaluation advising	56.0%	159	3.9
Application filing assistance	54.9%	156	3.7
Financial aid advising	42.3%	120	3.2
Housing information	32.0%	91	3.3
Hot line information	19.7%	56	3.3
Campus tour to:			
CSUS	13.0%	37	3.8
UCD	14.4%	41	3.8
UOP	4.6%	13	3.1

ARC
TABLE 3
WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS
ITEM A-3
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU PARTICIPATED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER WORKSHOPS OR SEMINARS, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 284

WORKSHOP OR SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
Application process	12.7%	36	4.1
Financial Aid	9.9%	28	3.7
Presentation by university professors	8.1%	23	3.6
Housing	4.6%	13	3.2

ARC
TABLE 4
TRANSFER ADMISSION AGREEMENT
ITEM A-4

Question: Did you sign a Transfer Admission Agreement?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	21.1%	60
No	73.2%	208
No Response	5.6%	16
Total	100.0%	284

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 60)

UCD	73.3%	44
CSUS	25.0%	15
UOP	-	-
No Response	1.7%	1
Total*	100.0%	60

*The total equals 100% because no one indicated signing an agreement with more than one school.

ARC
TABLE 5
ANTICIPATED TRANSFER MAJOR
ITEM A-5

Question: What is/was your anticipated transfer major?

MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	18.7%	53
Engineering	15.5%	44
Social and Behavioral Sciences	8.5%	24
Biological Sciences	10.6%	30
Education, Physical Education	5.3%	15
Fine and Applied Arts	6.0%	17
Physical Sciences	7.0%	20
English, Speech, Philosophy	3.5%	10
Health Professions	3.2%	9
Communications	1.8%	5
Mathematics	2.8%	8
Agriculture/Natural Resources	2.5%	7
Home Econ/Family & Consumer Sciences	1.8%	5
Computer and Information Science	2.8%	8
Protective and Social Services	1.4%	4
Foreign Languages	1.1%	3
Law	-	-
Occupational and Trade Tech	-	-
Undeclared or No Response	7.7%	22
Total	100.0%	284

Question: Did the Transfer Center assist you in this choice?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	18.3%	52
No	77.1%	219
No Response	4.6%	13
Total	100.0%	284

ARC

TABLE 6

APPLYING FOR ADMISSION TO A FOUR-YEAR SCHOOL

ITEM A-6

Question: After talking with a university representative, did you apply for admission to a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	59.5%	169
No	31.3%	89
No Response	9.2%	26
Total	100.0%	284

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 169)

CSU	43.2%	73
UC	56.8%	96
Private	4.1%	7
Other	1.8%	3
No Response	0.6%	1
Total*	106.5%	180

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied to more than one school.

ARC
TABLE 7
FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION
ITEM A-7

Question: Have you applied for any financial aid or scholarships to help you further your education at a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	28.9%	82
No	65.8%	187
No Response	5.3%	15
Total	100.0%	284

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 82)

UC	64.6%	53
CSU	31.7%	26
Private	4.9%	4
Other	3.7%	3
No Response	-	-
Total*	104.9%	86

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied for aid from more than one school.

ARC
TABLE 8
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STATUS
ITEM A-8
Maximum Number = 284

Question: What is your CURRENT educational status?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Attending a four-year school	27.5%	78
Attending ARC	68.0%	193
Attending SCC	1.1%	3
Attending CRC	0.4%	1
Other	3.2%	9
Transferred, but not attending now	3.2%	9
Did not transfer	0.7%	2
No Response	0.4%	1
Total*	104.5%	296

*The total is greater than 100% because some students indicated they are attending more than one institution.

ARC
TABLE 9
TRANSFER COLLEGE
ITEM B-1

Question: What is the name of your current (or most recently attended) college?

TRANSFER COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
CSU Sacramento	42.3%	33
Other CSU Campus	5.1%	4
UC Davis	39.7%	31
Other UC Campus	5.1%	4
University of the Pacific	5.1%	4
Other California Independent	1.3%	1
Outside California	1.3%	1
Total	100.0%	78

ARC
TABLE 10
ACTUAL TRANSFER MAJOR
ITEM B-1

Question: What is your major field of study?

MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	21.8%	17
Engineering	12.8%	10
Physical Sciences	12.8%	10
Social and Behavioral Sciences	3.8%	3
Biological Sciences	10.3%	8
Education/Physical Education	9.0%	7
Fine and Applied Arts*	7.7%	6
Communications/Journalism	2.6%	2
English/Speech/Philosophy	3.8%	3
Protective and Social Services	2.6%	2
Foreign Languages	2.6%	2
Home Ec/Family & Consumer Science	1.3%	1
Agriculture/Natural Resources	3.8%	3
Computer and Information Science	1.3%	1
Health Professions	-	-
Mathematics	-	-
General Education-Interdisciplinary	-	-
Law	-	-
Library Science	-	-
Occupational and Trade Tech	-	-
Undeclared	3.8%	3
Total	100.0%	78

*Includes Architecture and Environmental Design

ARC
TABLE 11
PROBLEMS IN TRANSFERRING
TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
ITEM B-2

Question: Did you have any problems transferring to the college indicated above?

PROBLEM?	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
No	68.8%	53
Yes	31.2%	24
Total	100.0%	77

TYPE OF PROBLEM (Maximum Number = 24)

Transferring Units	13.0%	10
Transcript Problems	19.5%	15
Admission Problems	9.1%	7
Other Transfer Problems	3.9%	3

Percentages for types of problems reported were calculated on total of 77 responses to Item B-2.

ARC
TABLE 12
UNITS ACCEPTED
ITEM B-3

Question: How many units earned at our college were not accepted at the college to which you transferred?

UNITS ACCEPTED/LOST	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
All Units Accepted	17.6%	12
Lost 1 - 3 Units	11.8%	8
Lost 4 - 6 Units	27.9%	19
Lost 7 - 12 Units	20.6%	14
Lost 13 - 21 Units	14.7%	10
Lost 22 or More Units	7.4%	5
Total	100.0%	68

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ARC

TABLE 13

STATUS/CLASSIFICATION

AT FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY

ITEM B-4

Question: If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

STATUS	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Full-time (12 or more units)	88.2%	67
Part-time (Fewer than 12 units)	11.8%	9
Total	100.0%	76

CLASSIFICATION		
Freshman	-	-
Sophomore	7.9%	6
Junior	84.2%	64
Senior	3.9%	3
Graduate Student	3.9%	3
Total	100.0%	76

ARC

TABLE 14

RATING FOR PREPARATION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

ITEM B-5

Ratings: 5 = Excellent . . . 1 = Inadequate

Question: How well did the course you completed at our college prepare you for continuing your education?

EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Preparation Was Excellent (5)	57.7%	45
Preparation Was Satisfactory (4)	23.1%	18
Good in Some Areas Only (3)	11.5%	9
Fair; All Could Have Been Better (2)	2.6%	2
Preparation Was Inadequate (1)	5.1%	4
Total	100.0%	78
Average Rating	4.3	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ARC

TABLE 15

FAMILY COLLEGE BACKGROUND

ITEM C-1

Question: Has anyone in your immediate family attended college?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	82.4%	234
No	14.8%	42
No Response	2.8%	8
Total	100.0%	284

Question: If yes, who? (Maximum Number = 234)

RELATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Sibling	69.2%	162
Father	59.4%	139
Mother	51.7%	121
Both Mother and Father	40.6%	95
Spouse	22.6%	53
Children	3.8%	9

ARC

TABLE 16

FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE CALCULATION

No other family member attended college	42
Other family member attended, but not parent(s)	69
Total	111
Percentage of 284 returned surveys	39.1%

ARC
TABLE 17
RATING FOR HELP
ITEM C-2
Ratings: 5 = Very Helpful . . . 1 = Unnecessary

Question: How helpful do you feel Transfer Center assistance would be for OTHER transfer-oriented students?

EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Very Helpful (5)	44.7%	127
Helpful (4)	33.8%	96
Possibly Helpful (3)	14.4%	41
Not Helpful (2)	2.5%	7
Unnecessary (1)	0.4%	1
No Response	4.2%	12
Total	100.0%	284
Average Rating of 272 Responses	4.3	

ARC
TABLE 18
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS
ITEM C-3

Question: What suggestions would you give for Transfer Center improvement?
Maximum Number = 284

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
More PERSONAL contact from four-year school reps	47.2%	134
On-the-spot admission evaluation (unofficial)	48.2%	137
More university information and publications	39.1%	111
On-the-spot financial aid calculation (estimate)	37.3%	106
More participation by UNIVERSITY faculty	32.0%	91
Evening Coverage (5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.)	24.3%	69
More participation by OUR college faculty	21.5%	61
Additional workshops*	8.1%	23
Other*	15.1%	43

*For a review of suggestions for workshops and of other suggestions see the main section of this report, pages 22 and 23.

TABLE 19
TABLE 20
TABLE 21

The results of Tables 19 and 20 were not tabulated by college. Table 21 is tabulated by college and presented that way in the body of the report.

ARC
TABLE 22
ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	Survey Population N=674	Respondent Population N=280	First-Generation Population N=109	Fall 1985 ARC Population N=17,468	Fall 1986 ARC Population N=19,271
White	73.4%	74.3%	67.0%	77.0%	76.9%
Asian	9.2%	9.6%	15.6%	5.9%	6.4%
Hispanic	5.9%	6.4%	9.2%	5.2%	5.6%
Black	4.9%	2.9%	0.9%	5.2%	4.8%
American Indian	1.5%	1.8%	2.8%	2.0%	2.1%
Other	3.1%	3.6%	3.7%	2.6%	2.3%
Not Coded	1.9%	1.4%	0.9%	2.0%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Missing Observations: Survey Population = 8; Respondents = 4; First-Generation = 2. The ethnicity of these students is unavailable since they were not registered Los Rios students.

ARC
TABLE 23
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
SURVEY POPULATION

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	2 - 4	139 - 153	49 - 50	53 - 22	14 - 9	257 - 238
Asian	1 - 0	22 - 25	4 - 5	2 - 1	0 - 2	29 - 33
Hispanic	1 - 0	8 - 11	4 - 3	9 - 2	0 - 2	22 - 18
Black	0 - 0	12 - 5	7 - 4	1 - 2	1 - 1	21 - 12
American Indian	0 - 0	2 - 1	2 - 2	1 - 1	1 - 0	6 - 4
Other	1 - 0	5 - 9	1 - 2	0 - 2	0 - 1	7 - 14
Not Coded	0 - 0	4 - 3	0 - 3	1 - 0	1 - 1	6 - 7
Total	5 - 4	192 - 207	67 - 69	67 - 30	17 - 16	348 - 326

Total Population: 674
Missing Observations: 8 (see Table 22)

ARC
TABLE 24
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENT POPULATION

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	1 - 3	56 - 57	21 - 20	27 - 10	7 - 6	112 - 96
Asian	0 - 0	8 - 13	2 - 1	1 - 1	0 - 1	11 - 16
Hispanic	1 - 0	4 - 6	1 - 2	4 - 0	0 - 0	10 - 8
Black	0 - 0	3 - 0	3 - 2	0 - 0	0 - 0	6 - 2
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	2 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 0	3 - 2
Other	1 - 0	3 - 3	1 - 0	0 - 2	0 - 0	5 - 5
Not Coded	0 - 0	2 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1	2 - 2
Total	3 - 3	76 - 81	30 - 25	33 - 14	7 - 8	149 - 131

Total Population: 280
Missing Observations: 4 (see Table 22)

ARC
TABLE 25
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 1	12 - 15	8 - 9	15 - 3	6 - 4	41 - 32
Asian	0 - 0	3 - 9	1 - 1	1 - 1	0 - 1	5 - 12
Hispanic	0 - 0	2 - 5	0 - 1	2 - 0	0 - 0	4 - 6
Black	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 0	1 - 2
Other	0 - 0	1 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	2 - 2
Not Coded	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 1
Total	0 - 1	18 - 31	11 - 11	19 - 6	6 - 6	54 - 55

Total Population: 109
Missing Observations: 2 (see Table 22)

ARC
TABLE 26
AGE AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: NOT YET TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	1 - 3	38 - 43	17 - 13	21 - 8	5 - 4	82 - 71
Asian	0 - 0	5 - 10	0 - 1	1 - 1	0 - 1	6 - 13
Hispanic	1 - 0	4 - 4	1 - 1	2 - 0	0 - 0	8 - 5
Black	0 - 0	2 - 0	1 - 2	0 - 0	0 - 0	3 - 2
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 0	2 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 0	3 - 1
Other	1 - 0	1 - 3	1 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	3 - 3
Not Coded	0 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 2
Total	3 - 3	51 - 61	22 - 17	25 - 10	5 - 6	106 - 97

Total Population: 203
Missing Observations: 3 (see Table 22)

ARC
TABLE 27
AGE AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 0	18 - 14	4 - 7	6 - 2	2 - 2	30 - 25
Asian	0 - 0	3 - 3	2 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	5 - 3
Hispanic	0 - 0	0 - 2	0 - 1	2 - 0	0 - 0	2 - 3
Black	0 - 0	1 - 0	2 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	3 - 0
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1
Other	0 - 0	2 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 2	0 - 0	2 - 2
Not Coded	0 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0
Total	0 - 0	25 - 20	8 - 8	8 - 4	2 - 2	43 - 34

Total Population: 77
Missing Observations: 1 (see Table 22)

ARC
TABLE 28
DECLARED CITIZENSHIP

	Respondents Not Transferred N=206	Respondents Transferred N=78
U. S. Citizen	90.8%	87.2%
Permanent Student Visa	2.4%	7.7%
Refugee Visa	3.9%	3.8%
Student Visa (F-1)	1.0%	-
Other Visa	0.5%	-
Missing	1.5%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

ARC
TABLE 29
EDUCATIONAL GOAL AT ADMISSION

	Respondents Not Transferred N=206	Respondents Transferred N=78
Transfer with Degree	45.1%	38.5%
Transfer without Degree	25.2%	16.7%
Vocational Degree	14.6%	17.9%
General Education Degree	8.3%	23.1%
No Objective	2.9%	2.6%
Vocational Certification	1.5%	-
Upgrade Job Skills	1.0%	-
Acquire Job Skills	-	-
Missing	1.5%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

(It is important to note that students are not asked to update their educational goals each semester they register.)

ARC
TABLE 30
UNIT LOAD FOR MOST RECENT SEMESTER

	Respondents Not Transferred N=203		Respondents Transferred N=77	
	Attempted	Completed	Attempted	Completed
12 or More Units	40.4%	39.9%	50.6%	50.6%
6 - 11.5 Units	38.9%	38.9%	26.0%	27.3%
Fewer than 6 Units	20.7%	21.2%	23.4%	22.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ARC
TABLE 31
CUMULATIVE UNITS COMPLETED

	Respondents Not Transferred N=203	Respondents Transferred N=77
0.0 - 15 Units	10.3%	1.3%
15.5 - 30 Units	10.4%	6.5%
30.5 - 45 Units	22.2%	7.8%
45.5 - 60 Units	18.2%	20.8%
60.5 - 75 Units	19.7%	27.2%
More Than 75 Units	19.2%	36.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

ARC
TABLE 32
CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

	Respondents Not Transferred N=203	Respondents Transferred N=76
Median	3.04	3.06
Mean	3.04	3.10

TABLES
COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

CRC
TABLE 1
AWARENESS
ITEM A-1

Question: How did you FIRST become aware of the Transfer Center?

SOURCE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Your visit to a counselor	37.6%	47
Transfer Center publicity	24.0%	30
Friend	6.4%	8
Other	5.6%	7
School paper	6.4%	8
Counselor class visit	9.6%	12
Instructor	8.8%	11
Transfer Center telephone call	-	-
No Response	1.6%	2
Total	100.0%	125

CRC
TABLE 2
SERVICES RATING
ITEM A-2
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU HAVE USED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER SERVICES, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 125

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
University catalogs and background info	72.0%	90	4.0
Interviews with university representatives	80.0%	100	4.1
Advice on General Ed/Breadth	64.0%	80	4.0
Advice on major	74.4%	93	3.7
Admission evaluation advising	59.2%	74	3.9
Application filing assistance	56.8%	71	4.0
Financial aid advising	47.2%	59	3.7
Housing information	33.6%	42	3.6
Hot line information	21.6%	27	3.3
Campus tour to:			
CSUS	18.4%	23	3.7
UCD	12.8%	16	4.2
UOP	9.6%	12	3.8

CRC
TABLE 3
WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS
ITEM A-3
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU PARTICIPATED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER WORKSHOPS OR SEMINARS, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 125

WORKSHOP OR SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
Application process	16.8%	21	3.8
Financial Aid	16.0%	20	4.0
Presentation by university professors	14.4%	18	3.7
Housing	8.0%	10	3.3

CRC
TABLE 4
TRANSFER ADMISSION AGREEMENT
ITEM A-4

Question: Did you sign a Transfer Admission Agreement?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	29.6%	37
No	63.2%	79
No Response	7.2%	9
Total	100.0%	125

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 37)

UCD	48.6%	18
CSUS	51.4%	19
UOP	-	-
No Response	2.7%	1
Total*	102.7%	38

*The total is greater than 100% because one person indicated signing an agreement with more than one school.

CRC

TABLE 5

ANTICIPATED TRANSFER MAJOR

ITEM A-5

Question: What is/was your anticipated transfer major?

MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	23.2%	29
Engineering	8.8%	11
Social and Behavioral Sciences	8.0%	10
Biological Sciences	3.2%	4
Education, Physical Education	9.6%	12
Fine and Applied Arts	8.0%	10
Physical Sciences	3.2%	4
English, Speech, Philosophy	3.2%	4
Health Professions	0.8%	1
Communications	6.4%	8
Mathematics	2.4%	3
Agriculture/Natural Resources	4.8%	6
Home Econ/Family & Consumer Sciences	2.4%	3
Computer and Information Science	-	-
Protective and Social Services	4.0%	5
Foreign Languages	-	-
Law	0.8%	1
Occupational and Trade Tech	0.8%	1
Undeclared or No Response	10.4%	13
Total	100.0%	125

Question: Did the Transfer Center assist you in this choice?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	21.6%	27
No	72.0%	90
No Response	6.4%	8
Total	100.0%	125

CRC

TABLE 6

APPLYING FOR ADMISSION TO A FOUR-YEAR SCHOOL

ITEM A-6

Question: After talking with a university representative, did you apply for admission to a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	57.6%	72
No	34.4%	43
No Response	8.0%	10
Total	100.0%	125

If yes where? (Maximum Number = 72)

CSU	62.5%	45
UC	38.9%	28
Private	2.8%	2
Other	2.8%	2
No Response	2.8%	2
Total*	109.8%	79

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied to more than one school.

CRC
TABLE 7
FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION
ITEM A-7

Question: Have you applied for any financial aid or scholarships to help you further your education at a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	28.8%	36
No	68.8%	86
No Response	2.4%	3
Total	100.0%	125

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 36)

UC	44.4%	16
CSU	41.7%	15
Private	5.6%	2
Other	11.1%	4
No Response	2.8%	1
Total*	105.6%	38

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied for aid from more than one school.

CRC
TABLE 8
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STATUS
ITEM A-8
Maximum Number = 125

Question: What is your CURRENT educational status?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Attending a four-year school	40.8%	51
Attending ARC	-	-
Attending SCC	4.0%	5
Attending CRC	48.0%	60
Other	5.6%	7
Transferred, but not attending now	2.4%	3
Did not transfer	4.0%	5
No Response	0.8%	1
Total*	105.6%	132

*The total is greater than 100% because some students indicated they are attending more than one institution.

CRC
TABLE 9
TRANSFER COLLEGE
ITEM B-1

Question: What is the name of your current (or most recently attended) college?

TRANSFER COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
CSU Sacramento	65.3%	32
Other CSU Campus	4.1%	2
UC Davis	16.3%	8
Other UC Campus	8.2%	4
University of the Pacific	2.0%	1
Other California Independent	-	-
Outside California	4.1%	2
Total	100.0%	49

CRC
TABLE 10
ACTUAL TRANSFER MAJOR
ITEM B-1

Question: What is your major field of study?

MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	24.5%	12
Engineering	4.1%	2
Physical Sciences	8.2%	4
Social and Behavioral Sciences	4.1%	2
Biological Sciences	2.0%	1
Education/Physical Education	10.2%	5
Fine and Applied Arts*	14.3%	7
Communications/Journalism	12.2%	6
English/Speech/Philosophy	4.1%	2
Protective and Social Services	2.0%	1
Foreign Languages	-	-
Home Ec/Family & Consumer Science	4.1%	2
Agriculture/Natural Resources	2.0%	1
Computer and Information Science	-	-
Health Professions	-	-
Mathematics	2.0%	1
General Education-Interdisciplinary	-	-
Law	-	-
Library Science	-	-
Occupational and Trade Tech	-	-
Undeclared	6.1%	3
Total	100.0%	49

*Includes Architecture and Environmental Design

CRC
TABLE 11
PROBLEMS IN TRANSFERRING
TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
ITEM B-2

Question: Did you have any problems transferring to the college indicated above?

PROBLEM?	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
No	78.7%	37
Yes	21.3%	10
Total	100.0%	47

TYPE OF PROBLEM (Maximum Number = 10)

Transferring Units	10.6%	5
Transcript Problems	6.4%	3
Admission Problems	-	-
Other Transfer Problems	6.4%	3

Percentages for types of problems reported were calculated on total of 47 responses to Item B-2.

CRC
TABLE 12
UNITS ACCEPTED
ITEM B-3

Question: How many units earned at our college were not accepted at the college to which you transferred?

UNITS ACCEPTED/LOST	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
All Units Accepted	24.4%	11
Lost 1 - 3 Units	8.9%	4
Lost 4 - 6 Units	11.1%	5
Lost 7 - 12 Units	28.9%	13
Lost 13 - 21 Units	13.3%	6
Lost 22 or More Units	13.3%	6
Total	100.0%	45

CRC
TABLE 13
STATUS/CLASSIFICATION
AT FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
ITEM B-4

Question: If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

STATUS	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Full-time (12 or more units)	80.9%	38
Part-time (Fewer than 12 units)	19.1%	9
Total	100.0%	47
CLASSIFICATION		
Freshman	4.3%	2
Sophomore	10.6%	5
Junior	74.5%	35
Senior	8.5%	4
Graduate Student	2.1%	1
Total	100.0%	47

CRC
TABLE 14
RATING FOR PREPARATION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
ITEM B-5
Ratings: 5 = Excellent . . . 1 = Inadequate

Question: How well did the course you completed at our college prepare you for continuing your education?

EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Preparation Was Excellent (5)	31.9%	15
Preparation Was Satisfactory (4)	46.8%	22
Good in Some Areas Only (3)	14.9%	7
Fair; All Could Have Been Better (2)	2.1%	1
Preparation Was Inadequate (1)	4.3%	2
Total	100.0%	47
Average Rating	4.0	

CRC

TABLE 15

FAMILY COLLEGE BACKGROUND

ITEM C-1

Question: Has anyone in your immediate family attended college?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	82.4%	103
No	16.8%	21
No Response	0.8%	1
Total	100.0%	125

Question: If yes, who? (Maximum Number = 103)

RELATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Sibling	66.0%	68
Father	50.5%	52
Mother	44.7%	46
Both Mother and Father	33.0%	34
Spouse	24.3%	25
Children	7.8%	8

CRC

TABLE 16

FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE CALCULATION

No other family member attended college	21
Other family member attended, but not parent(s)	39
Total	60
Percentage of 125 returned surveys	48.0%

CRC
TABLE 17
RATING FOR HELP
ITEM C-2
Ratings: 5 = Very Helpful . . . 1 = Unnecessary

Question: How helpful do you feel Transfer Center assistance would be for OTHER transfer-oriented students?

EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Very Helpful (5)	56.0%	70
Helpful (4)	32.0%	40
Possibly Helpful (3)	10.4%	13
Not Helpful (2)	-	-
Unnecessary (1)	0.8%	1
No Response	0.8%	1
Total	100.0%	125
Average Rating of 124 Responses	4.4	

CRC
TABLE 18
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS
ITEM C-3

Question: What suggestions would you give for Transfer Center improvement?
Maximum Number = 125

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
More PERSONAL contact from four-year school reps	38.4%	48
On-the-spot admission evaluation (unofficial)	40.0%	50
More university information and publications	43.2%	54
On-the-spot financial aid calculation (estimate)	31.2%	39
More participation by UNIVERSITY faculty	32.0%	40
Evening Coverage (5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.)	30.4%	38
More participation by OUR college faculty	24.0%	30
Additional workshops*	8.0%	10
Other*	16.0%	20

*For a review of suggestions for workshops and of other suggestions see the main section of this report, pages 22 and 23.

TABLE 19
TABLE 20
TABLE 21

The results of Tables 19 and 20 were not tabulated by college. Table 21 is tabulated by college and presented that way in the body of the report.

CRC
TABLE 22
ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	Survey Population N=368	Respondent Population N=120	First-Generation Population N=56	Fall 1985 CRC Population N=5,266	Fall 1986 CRC Population N=5,704
White	50.8%	62.5%	53.6%	64.0%	61.8%
Asian	17.4%	12.5%	19.6%	8.7%	8.9%
Hispanic	9.0%	8.3%	10.7%	8.0%	8.2%
Black	15.5%	11.7%	8.9%	13.2%	13.9%
American Indian	1.9%	2.5%	3.6%	1.9%	2.0%
Other	3.8%	2.5%	3.6%	2.4%	3.2%
Not Coded	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	2.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Missing Observations: Survey Population = 7; Respondents = 5; First-Generation = 4. The ethnicity of these students is unavailable since they were not registered Los Rios students.

CRC
TABLE 23
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
SURVEY POPULATION

	Numbers: Female - Male					
	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	3 - 2	52 - 52	15 - 7	29 - 10	14 - 3	113 - 74
Asian	3 - 1	22 - 24	0 - 1	4 - 6	1 - 2	30 - 34
Hispanic	0 - 0	12 - 11	4 - 1	2 - 0	1 - 2	19 - 14
Black	0 - 0	18 - 16	7 - 2	4 - 3	5 - 2	34 - 23
American Indian	1 - 0	0 - 1	2 - 1	2 - 0	0 - 0	5 - 2
Other	0 - 0	3 - 6	1 - 1	0 - 2	0 - 1	4 - 10
Not Coded	0 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 2	0 - 1	1 - 0	2 - 4
Total	7 - 3	108 - 111	29 - 15	41 - 22	22 - 10	207 - 161

Total Population: 368
Missing Observations: 7 (see Table 22)

CRC

TABLE 24

AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY

RESPONDENT POPULATION

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 0	23 - 21	5 - 2	14 - 4	6 - 0	48 - 27
Asian	1 - 0	7 - 3	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 2	9 - 6
Hispanic	0 - 0	3 - 3	2 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	7 - 3
Black	0 - 0	5 - 4	2 - 1	1 - 0	1 - 0	9 - 5
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	2 - 0	0 - 0	3 - 0
Other	0 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 2
Not Coded	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0
Total	1 - 0	39 - 32	10 - 3	18 - 5	9 - 3	77 - 43

Total Population: 120

Missing Observations: 5 (see Table 22)

CRC

TABLE 25

AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY

FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 0	7 - 6	2 - 2	8 - 3	2 - 0	19 - 11
Asian	1 - 0	4 - 2	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 2	6 - 5
Hispanic	0 - 0	1 - 1	2 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	5 - 1
Black	0 - 0	2 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	4 - 1
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	2 - 0
Other	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 2
Not Coded	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0
Total	1 - 0	14 - 11	6 - 2	10 - 4	5 - 3	36 - 20

Total Population: 56

Missing Observations: 4 (see Table 22)

CRC
TABLE 26
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: NOT YET TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 0	12 - 11	2 - 2	12 - 1	3 - 0	29 - 14
Asian	1 - 0	6 - 2	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	7 - 3
Hispanic	0 - 0	2 - 1	2 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	4 - 1
Black	0 - 0	4 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 0	1 - 0	7 - 2
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	2 - 0
Other	0 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 2
Not Coded	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0
Total	1 - 0	25 - 16	6 - 3	14 - 2	4 - 1	50 - 22

Total Population: 72
Missing Observations: 4 (see Table 22)

CRC
TABLE 27
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 0	11 - 10	3 - 0	2 - 3	3 - 0	19 - 13
Asian	0 - 0	1 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 2	2 - 3
Hispanic	0 - 0	1 - 2	0 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	3 - 2
Black	0 - 0	1 - 3	1 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	2 - 3
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0
Other	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0
Not Coded	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0
Total	0 - 0	14 - 16	4 - 0	4 - 3	5 - 2	27 - 21

Total Population: 48
Missing Observations: 1 (see Table 22)

CRC
TABLE 28
DECLARED CITIZENSHIP

	Respondents Not Transferred N=76	Respondents Transferred N=49
U. S. Citizen	88.2%	91.8%
Permanent Student Visa	5.3%	6.1%
Refugee Visa	1.3%	-
Student Visa (F-1)	-	-
Other Visa	-	-
Missing	5.3%	2.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

CRC
TABLE 29
EDUCATIONAL GOAL AT ADMISSION

	Respondents Not Transferred N=76	Respondents Transferred N=49
Transfer with Degree	53.9%	55.1%
Transfer without Degree	22.4%	22.4%
Vocational Degree	5.3%	14.3%
General Education Degree	1.3%	2.0%
No Objective	5.3%	4.1%
Vocational Certification	3.9%	-
Upgrade Job Skills	1.3%	-
Acquire Job Skills	1.3%	-
Missing	5.3%	2.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

(It is important to note that students are not asked to update their educational goals each semester they register.)

CRC

TABLE 30

UNIT LOAD FOR MOST RECENT SEMESTER

	Respondents Not Transferred N=72		Respondents Transferred N=48	
	Attempted	Completed	Attempted	Completed
12 or More Units	45.8%	45.8%	22.9%	20.8%
6 - 11.5 Units	32.0%	29.2%	35.4%	35.4%
Fewer than 6 Units	22.2%	25.0%	41.7%	43.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

CRC

TABLE 31

CUMULATIVE UNITS COMPLETED

	Respondents Not Transferred N=72	Respondents Transferred N=48
0.0 - 15 Units	27.8%	6.3%
15.5 - 30 Units	13.9%	10.4%
30.5 - 45 Units	8.3%	10.4%
45.5 - 60 Units	25.0%	20.8%
60.5 - 75 Units	18.1%	31.3%
More Than 75 Units	6.9%	20.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

CRC

TABLE 32

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

	Respondents Not Transferred N=72	Respondents Transferred N=48
Median	3.15	3.22
Mean	3.00	3.14

TABLES
SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

SCC
TABLE 1
AWARENESS
ITEM A-1

Question: How did you FIRST become aware of the Transfer Center?

SOURCE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Your visit to a counselor	38.6%	80
Transfer Center publicity	18.8%	39
Friend	15.2%	32
Other	7.7%	16
School paper	8.2%	17
Counselor class visit	2.9%	6
Instructor	6.3%	13
Transfer Center telephone call	0.5%	1
No Response	1.4%	3
Total	100.0%	207

SCC
TABLE 2
SERVICES RATING
ITEM A-2
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU HAVE USED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER SERVICES, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 207

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
University catalogs and background info	72.9%	151	4.0
Interviews with university representatives	68.1%	141	4.1
Advice on General Ed/Breadth	70.0%	145	3.9
Advice on major	63.3%	131	3.7
Admission evaluation advising	59.4%	123	4.0
Application filing assistance	57.5%	119	4.1
Financial aid advising	39.1%	81	3.5
Housing information	30.0%	62	3.3
Hot line information	18.8%	39	3.4
Campus tour to:			
CSUS	18.8%	39	3.9
UCD	15.5%	32	4.0
UOP	6.3%	13	3.5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCC

TABLE 3

WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS

ITEM A-3

Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

Question: IF YOU PARTICIPATED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER WORKSHOPS OR SEMINARS, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

Maximum Number = 207

WORKSHOP OR SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	AVERAGE RATING
Application process	17.9%	37	4.2
Financial Aid	11.1%	23	3.9
Presentation by university professors	10.6%	22	4.1
Housing	6.3%	13	3.7

SCC

TABLE 4

TRANSFER ADMISSION AGREEMENT

ITEM A-4

Question: Did you sign a Transfer Admission Agreement?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	25.1%	52
No	71.0%	147
No Response	3.9%	8
Total	100.0%	207

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 52)

UCD	44.2%	23
CSUS	51.9%	27
UOP	5.8%	3
No Response	3.8%	2
Total*	105.7%	55

*The total is greater than 100% because two people indicated signing an agreement with more than one school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCC

TABLE 5

ANTICIPATED TRANSFER MAJOR

ITEM A-5

Question: What is/was your anticipated transfer major?

MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	21.3%	44
Engineering	15.5%	32
Social and Behavioral Sciences	13.0%	27
Biological Sciences	7.7%	16
Education, Physical Education	4.8%	10
Fine and Applied Arts	2.4%	5
Physical Sciences	3.9%	8
English, Speech, Philosophy	4.8%	10
Health Professions	4.8%	10
Communications	2.4%	5
Mathematics	2.4%	5
Agriculture/Natural Resources	1.0%	2
Home Econ/Family & Consumer Sciences	3.4%	7
Computer and Information Science	2.9%	6
Protective and Social Services	1.4%	3
Foreign Languages	1.9%	4
Law	-	-
Occupational and Trade Tech	-	-
Undeclared or No Response	6.3%	13
Total	100.0%	207

Question: Did the Transfer Center assist you in this choice?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	18.4%	38
No	79.2%	164
No Response	2.4%	5
Total	100.0%	207

SCC
TABLE 6
APPLYING FOR ADMISSION TO A FOUR-YEAR SCHOOL
ITEM A-6

Question: After talking with a university representative, did you apply for admission to a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	62.8%	130
No	24.2%	50
No Response	13.0%	27
Total	100.0%	207

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 130)

CSU	60.0%	78
UC	42.3%	55
Private	2.3%	3
Other	-	-
No Response	1.5%	2
Total*	106.1%	138

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied to more than one school.

SCC
TABLE 7
FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION
ITEM A-7

Question: Have you applied for any financial aid or scholarships to help you further your education at a four-year school?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	36.2%	75
No	60.9%	126
No Response	2.9%	6
Total	100.0%	207

If yes, where? (Maximum Number = 75)

UC	41.3%	31
CSU	50.7%	38
Private	4.0%	3
Other	4.0%	3
No Response	2.7%	2
Total*	102.7%	77

*The total is greater than 100% because some students applied for aid from more than one school.

SCC
TABLE 8
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STATUS
ITEM A-8
Maximum Number = 207

Question: What is your CURRENT educational status?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Attending a four-year school	43.0%	89
Attending ARC	1.0%	2
Attending SCC	46.9%	97
Attending CRC	1.0%	2
Other	1.9%	4
Transferred, but not attending now	4.3%	9
Did not transfer	1.9%	4
No Response	1.0%	2
Total*	101.0%	209

*The total is greater than 100% because some students indicated they are attending more than one institution.

SCC
TABLE 9
TRANSFER COLLEGE
ITEM B-1

Question: What is the name of your current (or most recently attended) college?

TRANSFER COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
CSU Sacramento	58.7%	54
Other CSU Campus	8.7%	8
UC Davis	26.1%	24
Other UC Campus	6.5%	6
University of the Pacific	-	-
Other California Independent	-	-
Outside California	-	-
Total	100.0%	92

SCC
TABLE 10
ACTUAL TRANSFER MAJOR
ITEM B-1

Question: What is your major field of study?

MAJOR	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Business/Management	26.1%	24
Engineering	14.1%	13
Physical Sciences	3.3%	3
Social and Behavioral Sciences	13.0%	12
Biological Sciences	6.5%	6
Education/Physical Education	3.3%	3
Fine and Applied Arts*	2.2%	2
Communications/Journalism	3.3%	3
English/Speech/Philosophy	4.3%	4
Protective and Social Services	4.3%	4
Foreign Languages	4.3%	4
Home Ec/Family & Consumer Science	3.3%	3
Agriculture/Natural Resources	-	-
Computer and Information Science	3.3%	3
Health Professions	3.3%	3
Mathematics	2.2%	2
General Education-Interdisciplinary	-	-
Law	-	-
Library Science	-	-
Occupational and Trade Tech	-	-
Undeclared	3.3%	3
Total	100.0%	92

*Includes Architecture and Environmental Design

SCC
TABLE 11
PROBLEMS IN TRANSFERRING
TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
ITEM B-2

Question: Did you have any problems transferring to the college indicated above?

PROBLEM?	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
No	73.3%	66
Yes	26.7%	24
Total	100.0%	90

TYPE OF PROBLEM (Maximum Number = 24)

Transferring Units	11.1%	10
Transcript Problems	12.2%	11
Admission Problems	5.6%	5
Other Transfer Problems	5.6%	5

Percentages for types of problems reported were calculated on total of 90 responses to Item B-2.

SCC
TABLE 12
UNITS ACCEPTED
ITEM B-3

Question: How many units earned at our college were not accepted at the college to which you transferred?

UNITS ACCEPTED/LOST	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
All Units Accepted	31.0%	27
Lost 1 - 3 Units	19.5%	17
Lost 4 - 6 Units	11.5%	10
Lost 7 - 12 Units	23.0%	20
Lost 13 - 21 Units	6.9%	6
Lost 22 or More Units	8.0%	7
Total	100.0%	87

SCC
TABLE 13
STATUS/CLASSIFICATION
AT FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
ITEM B-4

Question: If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

STATUS	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Full-time (12 or more units)	84.1%	74
Part-time (Fewer than 12 units)	15.9%	14
Total	100.0%	88

CLASSIFICATION		
Freshman	2.3%	2
Sophomore	11.4%	10
Junior	81.8%	72
Senior	2.3%	2
Graduate Student	2.3%	2
Total	100.0%	88

SCC
TABLE 14
RATING FOR PREPARATION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
ITEM B-5
Ratings: 5 = Excellent . . . 1 = Inadequate

Question: How well did the course you completed at our college prepare you for continuing your education?

EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Preparation Was Excellent (5)	37.1%	33
Preparation Was Satisfactory (4)	43.8%	39
Good in Some Areas Only (3)	16.9%	15
Fair; All Could Have Been Better (2)	1.1%	1
Preparation Was Inadequate (1)	1.1%	1
Total	100.0%	89
Average Rating	4.1	

SCC

TABLE 15

FAMILY COLLEGE BACKGROUND

ITEM C-1

Question: Has anyone in your immediate family attended college?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	78.3%	162
No	18.8%	39
No Response	2.9%	6
Total	100.0%	207

Question: If yes, who? (Maximum Number = 162)

RELATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Sibling	75.9%	123
Father	59.3%	96
Mother	48.1%	78
Both Mother and Father	41.4%	67
Spouse	13.0%	21
Children	5.6%	9

SCC

TABLE 16

FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE CALCULATION

No other family member attended college	39
Other family member attended, but not parent(s)	54
Total	93
Percentage of 207 returned surveys	44.9%

SCC

TABLE 17

RATING FOR HELP

ITEM C-2

Ratings: 5 = Very Helpful . . . 1 = Unnecessary

Question: How helpful do you feel Transfer Center assistance would be for OTHER transfer-oriented students?

EVALUATION	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Very Helpful (5)	49.8%	103
Helpful (4)	31.9%	66
Possibly Helpful (3)	12.6%	26
Not Helpful (2)	1.9%	4
Unnecessary (1)	-	-
No Response	3.9%	8
Total	100.0%	207
Average Rating of 199 Responses	4.3	

SCC

TABLE 18

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

ITEM C-3

Question: What suggestions would you give for Transfer Center improvement?
Maximum Number = 207

SERVICES	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
More PERSONAL contact from four-year school reps	46.4%	96
On-the-spot admission evaluation (unofficial)	43.0%	89
More university information and publications	43.5%	90
On-the-spot financial aid calculation (estimate)	35.3%	73
More participation by UNIVERSITY faculty	34.8%	72
Evening Coverage (5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.)	26.1%	54
More participation by OUR college faculty	17.4%	36
Additional workshops*	7.7%	16
Other*	10.6%	22

*For a review of suggestions for workshops and of other suggestions see the main section of this report, pages 22 and 23.

TABLE 19

TABLE 20

TABLE 21

The results of Tables 19 and 20 were not tabulated by college. Table 21 is tabulated by college and presented that way in the body of the report.

SCC
TABLE 22
ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	Survey Population N=506	Respondent Population N=205	First-Generation Population N=94	Fall 1985 SCC Population N=13,085	Fall 1986 SCC Population N=13,334
White	41.3%	43.4%	27.7%	49.7%	51.8%
Asian	27.5%	32.7%	41.5%	16.4%	16.3%
Hispanic	10.9%	8.3%	12.8%	11.5%	11.2%
Black	11.3%	6.3%	6.4%	13.0%	11.5%
American Indian	2.2%	1.5%	1.1%	1.7%	1.9%
Other	3.0%	2.0%	3.2%	3.7%	3.7%
Not Coded	4.0%	5.9%	7.4%	4.1%	3.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Missing Observations: Survey Population = 4; Respondents = 2; First-Generation = 0. The ethnicity of these students is unavailable since they were not registered Los Rios students.

SCC
TABLE 23
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
SURVEY POPULATION

	Numbers: Female - Male					
	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	2 - 1	56 - 47	21 - 28	30 - 10	10 - 4	119 - 90
Asian	2 - 1	45 - 61	14 - 8	2 - 3	1 - 2	64 - 75
Hispanic	0 - 0	16 - 18	2 - 8	4 - 2	4 - 1	26 - 29
Black	1 - 0	18 - 11	9 - 7	4 - 1	4 - 2	36 - 21
American Indian	0 - 0	2 - 1	1 - 3	1 - 1	1 - 1	5 - 6
Other	1 - 0	1 - 3	2 - 3	3 - 2	0 - 0	7 - 8
Not Coded	1 - 0	5 - 5	2 - 1	1 - 1	3 - 1	12 - 8
Total	7 - 2	143 - 146	51 - 58	45 - 20	23 - 11	269 - 237

Total Population: 506
Missing Observations: 4 (see Table 22)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCC

TABLE 24

AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY

RESPONDENT POPULATION

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	2 - 0	20 - 24	7 - 12	12 - 3	7 - 2	48 - 41
Asian	0 - 1	27 - 29	6 - 2	1 - 1	0 - 0	34 - 33
Hispanic	0 - 0	3 - 8	1 - 2	1 - 0	2 - 0	7 - 10
Black	0 - 0	3 - 1	4 - 0	0 - 0	4 - 1	11 - 2
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 2
Other	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 2	0 - 0	1 - 3
Not Coded	1 - 0	2 - 4	2 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	5 - 7
Total	3 - 1	55 - 68	22 - 18	14 - 7	13 - 4	107 - 98

Total Population: 205

Missing Observations: 2 (see Table 22)

SCC

TABLE 25

AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY

FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 0	3 - 2	2 - 3	9 - 2	4 - 1	18 - 8
Asian	0 - 1	14 - 16	4 - 2	1 - 1	0 - 0	19 - 20
Hispanic	0 - 0	1 - 6	1 - 2	1 - 0	1 - 0	4 - 8
Black	0 - 0	2 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	3 - 0	6 - 0
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1
Other	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	1 - 2
Not Coded	1 - 0	1 - 3	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 1	2 - 5
Total	1 - 1	21 - 29	9 - 7	11 - 5	8 - 2	50 - 44

Total Population: 94

Missing Observations: 0 (see Table 22)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCC
TABLE 26
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: NOT YET TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	0 - 0	12 - 12	5 - 8	6 - 1	3 - 1	26 - 22
Asian	0 - 0	10 - 23	3 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 0	13 - 25
Hispanic	0 - 0	1 - 3	1 - 1	0 - 0	1 - 0	3 - 4
Black	0 - 0	3 - 1	3 - 0	0 - 0	3 - 1	9 - 2
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 2
Other	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 1
Not Coded	1 - 0	0 - 1	2 - 1	0 - 0	0 - 1	3 - 3
Total	1 - 0	26 - 41	15 - 12	6 - 3	7 - 3	55 - 59

Total Population: 114
Missing Observations: 1 (see Table 22)

SCC
TABLE 27
AGE SEX AND ETHNICITY
RESPONDENTS: TRANSFERRED

Numbers: Female - Male

	Under 18	18-24	25-29	30-39	40 & +	Total
	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M	F - M
White	2 - 0	8 - 12	2 - 4	6 - 2	4 - 1	22 - 19
Asian	0 - 1	17 - 6	3 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 0	21 - 8
Hispanic	0 - 0	2 - 5	0 - 1	1 - 0	1 - 0	4 - 6
Black	0 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	0 - 0	1 - 0	2 - 0
American Indian	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0	0 - 0
Other	0 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	1 - 2
Not Coded	0 - 0	2 - 3	0 - 0	0 - 1	0 - 0	2 - 4
Total	2 - 1	29 - 27	7 - 6	8 - 4	6 - 1	52 - 39

Total Population: 91
Missing Observations: 1 (see Table 22)

SCC

TABLE 28

DECLARED CITIZENSHIP

	Respondents Not Transferred N=115	Respondents Transferred N=92
U. S. Citizen	79.1%	85.9%
Permanent Student Visa	13.9%	7.6%
Refugee Visa	4.3%	1.1%
Student Visa (F-1)	1.7%	3.3%
Other Visa	-	-
Missing	0.9%	2.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

SCC

TABLE 29

EDUCATIONAL GOAL AT ADMISSION

	Respondents Not Transferred N=115	Respondents Transferred N=92
Transfer with Degree	41.7%	26.1%
Transfer without Degree	34.8%	25.0%
Vocational Degree	2.6%	14.1%
General Education Degree	10.4%	22.8%
No Objective	7.8%	8.7%
Vocational Certification	1.7%	-
Upgrade Job Skills	-	1.1%
Acquire Job Skills	-	1.1%
Missing	0.9%	1.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

(It is important to note that students are not asked to update their educational goals each semester they register.)

SCC

TABLE 30

UNIT LOAD FOR MOST RECENT SEMESTER

	Respondents Not Transferred N=114		Respondents Transferred N=91	
	Attempted	Completed	Attempted	Completed
12 or More Units	50.0%	47.4%	30.8%	30.8%
6 - 11.5 Units	28.9%	28.9%	27.4%	26.3%
Fewer than 6 Units	21.1%	23.7%	41.8%	42.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SCC

TABLE 31

CUMULATIVE UNITS COMPLETED

	Respondents Not Transferred N=114	Respondents Transferred N=91
0.0 - 15 Units	2.6%	6.6%
15.5 - 30 Units	10.6%	13.2%
30.5 - 45 Units	27.2%	8.8%
45.5 - 60 Units	27.1%	18.7%
60.5 - 75 Units	16.7%	30.7%
More Than 75 Units	15.8%	22.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

SCC

TABLE 32

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

	Respondents Not Transferred N=114	Respondents Transferred N=91
Median	3.08	3.24
Mean	3.04	3.12

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

Letters from Los Rios Chancellor

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

Los Rios Community College District

Transfer Center Survey
1919 Spanos Court
Sacramento, CA 95825-3981

Transfer CENTER

FOR COLLEGE USE ONLY

Please make corrections to the information above if necessary.

PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BLOCK(S) WITHIN EACH CATEGORY BELOW

SECTION A EVERYONE SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION

1 How did you FIRST become aware of the Transfer Center? (Choose ONE only.)

1 ☐ School paper
2 ☐ Instructor
3 ☐ Counselor class visit
4 ☐ Your visit to a counselor
5 ☐ Transfer Center publicity
6 ☐ Transfer Center telephone call
7 ☐ Friend
8 ☐ Other (please specify) _____

2 IF YOU HAVE USED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER SERVICES, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

	Very Good 5	Good 4	Ave 3	Poor 2	Very Poor 1
A. Interviews with university representatives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B. University catalogs and background information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C. Housing information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D. Financial aid advising	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E. Application filing assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
F. Advice on General Ed/Breadth	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
G. Advice on major	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
H. Admission evaluation advising	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I. Hot line information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Campus tour to:					
J. UOP	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
K. CSUS	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
L. UCD	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3 IF YOU PARTICIPATED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING TRANSFER CENTER WORKSHOPS OR SEMINARS, please rate them as to how well they served your individual needs.

	Very Good 5	Good 4	Ave 3	Poor 2	Very Poor 1
A. Financial Aid	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B. Application process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C. Housing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D. Presentation by university professors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4 Did you sign a Transfer Admission Agreement?

1 ☐ Yes: Where? → ☐ UOP ☐ CSUS ☐ UCD
2 ☐ No

5 What is/was your anticipated transfer major? _____

Did the Transfer Center assist you in this choice?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

For College Use Only

6 After talking with a university representative, did you apply for admission to a four-year school?

☐ Yes: Where? → ☐ UC: Campus _____ ☐ CSU: Campus _____ ☐ Private: Name _____ ☐ Other: Name _____
☐ No

7 Have you applied for any financial aid or scholarships to help further your education at a four-year school?

1 ☐ Yes: Where? → ☐ UC: Campus _____ ☐ CSU: Campus _____ ☐ Private: Name _____ ☐ Other: Name _____
2 ☐ No

8 What is your CURRENT educational status?

A ☐ Attending ARC
B ☐ Attending CRC
C ☐ Attending SCC
D ☐ Attending a four-year school
E ☐ Transferred, but not attending now
F ☐ Did not transfer
G ☐ Other (specify) _____

OVER PLEASE!

LRCCD86/OP & R

SECTION B

IF YOU HAVE ALREADY TRANSFERRED TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE, PLEASE ANSWER THIS SECTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO SECTION C.

1 Please respond below regarding your current (or most recently attended) college.

Name of College _____

City and State _____

Major Field of Study (at college indicated above) _____

☐☐☐☐ TC [College code] TM ☐☐☐☐

2 Did you have problems transferring to the college indicated above?

1 ☐ Yes; What? →
- ☐ Transferring units
- ☐ Transcript problems
- ☐ Admission problems
- ☐ Other (describe) _____

2 ☐ No

3 How many units earned at our college were not accepted at the college indicated above?

1 ☐ All units accepted
2 ☐ Lost 1-3 units
3 ☐ Lost 4-6 units
4 ☐ Lost 7-12 units
5 ☐ Lost 13-21 units
6 ☐ Lost more than 21 units

4 If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

STATUS
1 ☐ Part-time Student (Fewer than 12 units)
2 ☐ Full-time Student (12 or more units)

CLASSIFICATION
1 ☐ Freshman
2 ☐ Sophomore
3 ☐ Junior
4 ☐ Senior
5 ☐ Graduate Student

5 How well did the courses you completed at our college prepare you for continuing your education?

5 ☐ Preparation was excellent
4 ☐ Preparation was satisfactory
3 ☐ Good in some areas only
2 ☐ Fair; all areas could have been better
1 ☐ Preparation was inadequate

SECTION C

EVERYONE SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION.

1 Has anyone in your immediate family attended college?

1 ☐ Yes: Who? →
- ☐ Mother
- ☐ Father
- ☐ Sister
- ☐ Brother
- ☐ Spouse
- ☐ Children

2 ☐ No

2 How helpful do you feel Transfer Center assistance would be for OTHER transfer-oriented students?

Very Helpful	Helpful	Possibly Helpful	Not Helpful	Unnecessary
5	4	3	2	1
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3 What suggestions would you give for Transfer Center improvement?

A ☐ On-the-spot financial aid calculation (estimate)
B ☐ On-the-spot admission evaluation (unofficial)
C ☐ Evening coverage (5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.)
D ☐ More participation by OUR college faculty
E ☐ More participation by UNIVERSITY faculty
F ☐ More printed information and publications from four-year schools
G ☐ More PERSONAL contact from four-year school representatives
H ☐ Additional workshops: Such as _____
I ☐ Other suggestions: _____

4 We would appreciate any additional comments regarding how we could improve the services we have provided. Please use the space below for your comments.

SPACE BELOW RESERVED FOR COMMENTS

LRCCD86/OP & R

THANK YOU FOR ASSISTING US IN OUR SURVEY! PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM IN THE PREPAID ENVELOPE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Sacramento City College 1916 — American River College 1955 — Cosumnes River College 1970

DAVID MERTES
Chancellor/Superintendent

November 24, 1986

Hello:

The Transfer Center Project needs your help! As someone who used the Center during its first year of operation, you can help us to evaluate its effectiveness.

Since the Transfer Center is a part of a pilot project supported by State funds, we will need to demonstrate its value if we are to receive support for continued operation. We will be judged on our ability to help you and other potential transfer students.

Please take time to read the questions carefully and to answer them honestly. Then return the questionnaire promptly in the postpaid envelope.

Your participation in this survey is important because your answers will help us to refine our operation. In addition, if you have any comments or suggestions, please include them. We have left a section on the back of the questionnaire for that purpose.

The data you and others provide will be summarized to help us improve our services, but your individual response will be held in strict confidence. If you have any questions about the survey please call us at (916) 920-7829. Meanwhile, thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

David Mertes

David Mertes
Chancellor

Enclosures

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 • (916) 920-7821

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Sacramento City College 1916 — American River College 1955 — Cosumnes River College 1970

DAVID MERTES
Chancellor/Superintendent

December 15, 1986

Hello:

Recently we sent you a survey asking you to evaluate the services of the Transfer Center and to return it. We have not yet received your reply.

Your response is important. We want the survey results to reflect the opinions of all students who used the Center during its first year of operation. Please help us by taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the postpaid envelope. Your answers will be held in confidence, and only summarized information will be reported.

This is your opportunity to help the Transfer Center evaluate and improve its services. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Please respond today!

Sincerely,

David Mertes

David Mertes
Chancellor

Enclosures

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
OCT 23 1987

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 • (916) 920-7821